A. 12 (A)

	Page 1		
1	HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA		
2	UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT		
3	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK		
4	X		
5	In Re:		
6	Chapter 11		
7	LEHMAN BROTHERS Case No. 08-13555(JMP)		
8	HOLDINGS, INC., et al., (Jointly Administered)		
9			
	Debtors.		
10			
	X		
11			
12	* * *HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL* * *		
13	DEPOSITION OF JAMES HRASKA		
14	New York, New York		
15	August 14, 2009		
1.6			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23	Reported by:		
24	KATHY S. KLEPFER, RMR, RPR, CRR, CLR		
25	JOB NO. 24039		

	Page 2		Page 3
1	HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA	1	HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA
2	August 14, 2009	2	
3	9:25 a.m.	3	APPEARANCES:
4		4	
5	HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL deposition	5	JONES DAY, LLP
6	of JAMES HRASKA, held at Jones Day	6	Attorneys for Lehman Brothers, Inc.
7	LLP, 222 East 41st Street, LLP, New	7	222 East 41st Street
8	York, New York, before Kathy S.	8	New York, New York 10017-6702
9	Klepfer, a Registered Professional	9	BY: WILLIAM J. HINE, ESQ.
10	Reporter, Registered Merit Reporter,	10 11	GEORGE E. SPENCER, ESQ.
11	Certified Realtime Reporter, Certified	12	BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER, LLP
12 13	Livenote Reporter, and Notary Public of the State of New York.	13	Attorneys for Barclays and the Witness
13 14	of the state of New 10fk.	14	5301 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.
L4 L5		15	Washington, D.C. 20015
16		16	BY: JONATHAN M. SHAW, ESQ.
17		17	, ,
18		18	QUINN, EMANUEL, URQUHART, OLIVER & HEDGES, LLP
19		19	Attorneys for the Creditors Committee
20		20	51 Madison Avenue
21		21	22nd Floor
22		22	New York, New York 10010
23		23	BY: ERIC M. KAY, ESQ.
24		24	
25		25	
	Page 4		Page 5
1	HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA	1	HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA
2		2	JAMES HRASKA, called as a
3	APPEARANCES: (Cont'd.)	3	witness, having been duly sworn by a Notary
4 5	IENNED & DIOCK LID	4 5	Public, was examined and testified as follows:
6	JENNER & BLOCK, LLP Attorneys for the Examiner	6	EXAMINATION BY
7	330 N. Wabash Avenue	7	MR. HINE:
8	Chicago, Illinois 60611-7603	8	Q. Good morning, Mr. Hraska.
9	BY: DAVID C. LAYDEN, ESQ.	9	A. Good morning.
10		10	Q. We met just briefly before the
11	HUGHES, HUBBARD & REED, LLP	11	deposition. My name is Bill Hine. I'm from the
12	110001110 0 101 011 11 1100000	12	firm of Jones Day and we are special counsel to
13		13	Lehman Brothers Holdings, Inc., in connection
14	11011 10111, 11011 10001	14	with the pending bankruptcy proceeding. And so
15	21.1(212).0120,200,	15	your deposition is being taken today pursuant to
16	121121111111111111111111111111111111111	16 17	that discovery that we're taking in that case. There's several other counsel around
17		1 / 18	the table who will introduce themselves as they
18 19		19	get up to take turns questioning.
20	11100110011	20	Have you ever had a deposition taken
21		21	before?
22		22	A. I have not.
23		23	Q. So, just by way of a little ground
24		24	rules, I'm going to ask you a bunch of
25		25	questions. You're under oath. You're going to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 6

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA answer the questions.

On occasion, your counsel will state an objection or, you know, make some kind of objection for the record. That doesn't relieve you of the obligation to answer the question. It's just him trying to either correct a portion of my question or preserve an objection.

In that regard, throughout the day, I am undoubtedly going to a misuse a word or some kind of acronym or some technical term that you folks use every day in your line of business which I'm not as familiar with as you are, obviously, so please correct me if I misuse a word or I ask a question that's misleading in any way or you just don't understand the question because I would like to ask a clear question so you can answer it.

Is that okay?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

A. That's fine. Thank you.

MR. SHAW: Just before we begin, again, I want to put on the record our understanding that we will designate the entire transcript highly confidential and then we'll go back and redesignate.

Page 7

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA MR. HINE: Yes. That's true. That's fine.

Q. One other thing before we get started, Mr. Hraska. I imagine you're aware that you've been designated as what's called a 30(b)(6) witness by your employer, by Barclays, as to particular topics, and they relate to Schedules A and B which we'll discuss later. So when we get to that portion of the deposition, I'll let you know and we'll treat that portion as a 30(b)(6) deposition, but I'll let you know as we get there.

MR. SHAW: Just so we're, again, clear, Bill, as I think you know, he is one of several witnesses who's been designated as partially responsive to those particular topics.

MR. HINE: I understand.

Q. So, unless you have any questions, we can get started.

A. No, I'm fine.

Q. Okay. Can we just review briefly your employment history with Lehman? What was the last position you held at Lehman? I'm talking

Page 8

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA about in the period of September 2008.

A. I was senior vice president from a corporate title perspective and I managed the Secured Financing Operations Group.

Q. And can you just describe for me what that means? What were your responsibilities and duties in that position?

A. The Financing Operations, also known as a financing middle office, is a group that sits between a bunch of groups, but primarily trading and sales individuals and clearance and settlements folks, and we do tasks such as, you know, monitoring positions, reconciling differences, dealing with, you know, customer, you know, concerns, bringing the attention of customers' concerns to either sales staff or trading staff.

We also deal with legal and compliance and regulatory on certain matters. If there are, you know, questions or queries as to the nature of the transactions, if somebody needs some technical expertise on, we usually provide that expertise as to the structure of the transactions and things like that.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA

Q. And who did you report to in that position?

A. At Lehman Brothers at the time, I was reporting to Monty Forrest.

Q. Did you report directly to anyone else?

A. No, under that structure I was a direct report of Monty Forrest.

Q. And who were your direct reports?

- A. My direct reports now or at the time?
- Q. At the time in September of 2008.

A. Okay, my direct reports in the U.S.

were Nancy Denig, D-E-N-I-G, and Paul Lindner.

Q. Prior to this position -- or, let me ask you another question. How long were you in this senior vice president position?

A. Approximately five to six years. I don't remember the exact date, actually. I don't remember the exact date when I got my senior vice presidentship.

Q. Okay. How long had you been in the position of managing the secured financing?

A. It began in 2001, but it began in a much smaller scale. I only managed a portion of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

.0

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 10

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA

it and over time it grew into a larger and larger responsibility. At the point of

September, I was managing both equity and fixed income. I was managing that globally as well.

- Q. Okay. When did you join Lehman?
- A. August of '93.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

. 0

1

L2

. 3

4

. 5

. 6

.7

. 8

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

.0

1

2

.3

4

. 5

. 6

. 7

. 8

. 9

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. So you held this management position since 2001, you said?
- A. That particular one related to Financing Operations since 2001, yes.
 - Q. What did you do before that at Lehman?
- A. I did a host of different roles, all in derivatives-based. I worked in Derivative Settlements, I worked in Derivatives Middle Office, and I also worked in a Structured Products and Reinsurance Middle Office as well.
 - Q. Okay:
- A. And over the period of time I also held management positions in those roles as well.
- Q. When you say middle office, could you just tell me what that means?
- A. Middle office is similar to the way I described it before for financing, only it was

Page 11

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA for derivative-related products. So same types of trader inquiries, sales inquiries, customer resolutions to problems, things like that.

Q. Did there come a point when you left Lehman and moved to Barclays?

A. Yeah, I mean after the -- after the declaration of bankruptcy, Barclays extended an offer of employment to me, which I accepted.

Q. Okay. And when did you start working for Barclays, do you recall the date?

A. I don't know, I can't for certain be given the official date. When I started, I was extended an employment contract, which I signed, and I believe I signed that sometime in October, but I don't know what the specific date that Barclays considers me an official employee versus when I stopped my Lehman employment.

Like I was never out of work for a period of time. I mean, I continued to show up every day. I'm just not sure what point in time they considered me officially a Barclays employee.

Q. I understand. When did you consider yourself to be working for Barclays?

Page 12

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA

A. I mean, I guess I considered myself to be working for Barclays in the week after the declaration of bankruptcy.

Q. Okay. We're going to be talking about these weeks for the whole deposition, so the week of September 15 is the week you're referring to as the week where they declared bankruptcy; is that right?

A. The week is when -- September 15 is when Lehman declared bankruptcy. I wasn't completely confident that I was a Barclays employee until I guess the week of the 22nd, because I was still working, you know, with LBI in the U.S. broker-dealer, so I wasn't actually sure of my status at that point, to be completely honest.

Q. I understand. Okay. So that September 22 was a Monday, correct?

- A. I believe so, yeah.
- Q. Had you had any discussions with folks at Barclays prior to September 22 about the possibility of you going to work for Barclays?
 - A. No.
 - Q. When do you recall first speaking to

Page 13

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA anyone at Barclays about you becoming a Barclays employee?

- A. I would say it was in that week of the 22nd.
- Q. Okay. Had you spoken to any folks at Lehman prior to September 22 about the possibility of you moving over and becoming a Barclays employee?
- A. Well, wait. Could I just go back to that previous question?
 - Q. Sure.

A. When I spoke on that week of September 22, like I had never had any employment conversations with a legacy Barclays employee. All my conversations were with legacy Lehman employees, so either my manager, which was Monty Forrest, or Alastair Blackwell.

So like nobody from like Barclays HR had approached me or had offered me any conversations prior to my conversations with my legacy Lehman managers. I don't know if that's important or not.

Q. No, I just want to make sure we're all on the same page here.

Page 15 Page 14 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA 1 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA 1 2 2 So when you say legacy Lehman Q. Okay. Before I forget, what is your 3 3 managers, you're talking about people who were current position at Barclays? previously employed with Lehman who may now be 4 4 A. I am in a very similar role. 5 employed with Barclays? 5 Corporate title-wise I'm a director, which is 6 6 A. Yes. equivalent to SVP. I manage, again, Secured 7 7 Financing Operations for both equities globally Q. Okay. So am I correct to say that, 8 prior to September 22, you had had no 8 and fixed income in North America. 9 conversations with anyone who was -- who had 9 Q. Is it fair to say your role is -- your 10 always been a Barclays employee as to your 10 duties and responsibilities are relatively the 11 11 same as you had when you were at Lehman? possibility of you going over working for 12 Barclays; is that right? 12 A. Responsibilities are reasonably the 13 A. That's correct. 13 same, not quite as extensive as they were at 14 Q. So had you had conversations with 14 Lehman from a global perspective. 15 legacy Lehman employees or people who were 15 Q. Who do you report directly to now? 16 employed with Lehman at the time prior to 16 A. I have a dual reporting line. From a 17 September 22 about the possibility of you going 17 product perspective, I still report to Monty 18 to work for Barclays? 18 Forrest. And Barclays is structured a little 19 A. No. 19 bit different, so from a regional perspective, I 20 Q. Okay. Do you recall any conversations 20 report to Alastair Blackwell. 21 with Mr. Forrest or anyone in your chain of 21 Q. And who are your direct reports? 22 22 A. My direct reports now are still Nancy command about the possibility of you going to 23 23 Denig, Paul Lindner, and a gentleman by the name work for Barclays? 24 MR. SHAW: Asked and answered. 24 of Henry Duarte, D-U-A-R-T-E. 25 25 Q. Okay. Anyone else? A. No. Page 17 Page 16 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA 1 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA 1 2 A. I don't believe so. 2 A. No. Not direct reports, no. 3 3 No, on October 2, when it's dated. (Exhibit 136B, a document bearing Bates Nos. BCI-EX-00077317 through 77319, 4 Q. Okay. Any understanding of why it's 4 5 dated September 22, but you didn't sign it until 5 marked for identification, as of this date.) 6 6 O. Mr. Hraska, I apologize, I'm not October 2? trying to be intrusive here, but I need to ask 7 MR. SHAW: Foundation. 7 you some questions about your compensation. 8 A. I have no idea. I mean, I'm -- I 8 9 signed it September 22nd because that's when I 9 A. That's fine. 10 10 decided to agree to the terms. Q. So I'm handing you a copy of Exhibit 136B, which appears to be an agreement between 11 Q. Okay. Was there any negotiations 11 12 yourself and Barclays dated September 22, 2008, 12 between you and Barclays as to the compensation 13 13 part of your employment? and my question to you is, have you ever seen 14 14 this document before? A. No. Q. Okay. How did it take place? Did 15 15 MR. SHAW: Take a minute to look at as 16 they just give you a copy of this letter and ask 16 much of it as you need to. 17 vou to sign it? 17 A. Yes, I've seen this before. A. The letter was sent to me via 18 18 Q. What is this document? 19 interoffice mail. 19 A. This was the document offering me 20 20 employment at Barclays. Q. Uh-huh. A. It was preceded by a phone call which 21 Q. Okay. And is this your current 21 said, you know, you're a key employee that we 22 22 employment contract with Barclays? 23 would like to retain, we're going to be sending 23 A. It is, yes. 24 you a letter for, you know, an offer to join 24 Okay. Did you sign it on September Q.

25

22?

Barclays. We would like you to review it and,

Page 18	Page 19
HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA you know, if you would like to come work for us, you know, accept it, which is, at the time, I was happy to be offered a job, so with what was going on in the market, so I took it. Q. Who was that phone call from? A. Ian Lowitt.	1 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA
REDACTED	REDACTED
Page 20 1 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA	Page 21 1 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA
	REDACTED
	Q. Okay. Stepping aside from your own personal compensation now, throughout the period of September the week of September 15 to the 22, did you have any understanding of the compensation-related provisions embodied in the transaction that was taking place between Barclays and Lehman at the time? A. No, I did not. Q. Let me just take a step back and I would like to get a little sense of your involvement in that transaction during that week, if you don't mind. I'd like to just kind of go day-by-day for a minute here just to understand what you were involved in during that

Page 23 Page 22 1 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA 1 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA 2 2 week. A. Yes. 3 On September 15, 2008, when Lehman 3 Q. What had you heard about them? 4 Brothers Holdings declared bankruptcy, did you 4 A. That there were discussions taking 5 have any involvement in the preparation of the 5 place and they were at the levels of Bart 6 filing or the preparation of any kind of 6 McDade, Dick Fuld, those types of individuals. 7 7 bankruptcy proceedings? Q. Fair to say you were not involved in 8 A. No. 8 those negotiations? 9 Q. Did you know that they were going to 9 A. Yes. 10 file bankruptcy before that Monday? 10 Q. Were you called at any time during 11 11 that weekend to provide information to the 12 12 Q. Did it come as a surprise to you? people who were involved in the negotiations? 13 13 A. It was a -- it was a surprise to me, A. Could I ask you to clarify? Regarding 14 yeah. The right answer is yes. 14 information regarding the negotiations or 15 Q. The weekend prior to the bankruptcy 15 information about other topics? 16 filing -- and I'm talking about September 13th 16 Q. Well, I'm not talking about 17 17 and 14th or so? run-in-the-mill information that you would 18 A. Uh-huh. 18 normally be dealing with, but did anyone contact 19 19 you seeking information that you perceived to be Q. I understand there was some 20 20 discussions between Barclays and Lehman, and my involved in the negotiations? 21 question is, did you have any involvement in 21 A. No. 22 22 those discussions? Q. Did you have any conversations with 23 23 Mr. McDade or senior officers during that A. No. 24 Q. Did you have any knowledge that such 24 weekend? 25 25 discussions were taking place? A. No. Page 25 Page 24 1 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA 1 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA 2 2 don't know beyond that where it was subsequently Q. Okay. Because you asked for the 3 3 clarification, I just want to know, did you have forwarded to. 4 some communications that your -- well, let me 4 Q. And just so I understand what type of 5 5 information, this is information about the types scratch that. 6 6 of securities that would be eligible to be Did you provide information to anyone 7 during that weekend as to the value of 7 pledged as collateral for a financing; is that 8 8 securities in Lehman's books? right? 9 9 A. So let me clarify that. I provided A. Yes, that's correct. . 0 information as to the location and availability 10 Q. Okay. And do you know what purpose 11 .1 of securities, not the value of securities. that financing was to serve? .2 .2 Could you clarify what you mean by O. Okay. What information did you .3 provide? 13 that? 14 . 4 A. I provided lists of securities that Q. Do you know what type of financing 15 . 5 would be eligible to place into financing they were talking about? . 6 A. They were talking about like secured . 6 transactions. 17 financing transactions, which are normal course L7 Q. And who did you provide that to? A. Well, I was asked for it by my .8 18 for what I support, so ... manager, which is Monty Forrest, but I believe 19 9 Q. I guess my question is, you're aware 20 20 that information was disseminated to multiple that during the following week the Fed provided 21 some financing to Lehman, correct? 21 people after I provided it, so ... 22 22 Q. You don't really know where it went A. Right. 23 after you gave it to Monty? 23 O. Were the lists that you were providing to be used towards that type of financing, do A. I know that it was sent to Alastair. 24 24

25

vou think?

I know that it was sent to Paolo Tonucci. I

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

. 0

11

12

3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

. 0

11

L2

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

Page 26

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA

MR. SHAW: If you know.

A. It was used -- it was to be used for anybody who would provide us secured financing. In the end, it ended up being the Fed, but --

- Q. Did you have any understanding during that weekend that there were discussions between Lehman and the Fed about providing financing?
 - A. No, not specifically.
- Q. Okay. Let's just continue through the week briefly and then we'll come back to different topics.

On the Monday of the 15th, were you involved in any negotiations between Barclays concerning the sale transaction that ultimately took place between Barclays and Lehman?

A. No.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

1

2

13

4

15

. 6

.7

8

9

20

21

2

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

0

11

2

.3

L 4

. 5

6

9

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Were you asked to provide any information to those who were involved in those negotiations?
 - A. No.
- Q. Were you involved in negotiations with the Fed about the Fed financing that was provided during that week?
 - A. No.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA

- Q. Were you asked to provide information in support of that financing?
 - A. No.
- Q. Okay. What did you do ultimately on that Monday, if you recall?
 - A. A year ago?
- Q. Well, it's a big day. It's an eventful day in Lehman's history, correct?
 - A. It is.

Q. What do you recall doing the Monday when Lehman Holdings filed for bankruptcy?

A. Well, I mean, I guess the first thing to do was, you know, talk to my manager and ask him, you know, kind of what our next steps were. Do we carry on as normal, do we do something different, or do we wait for further instructions or, you know, basically what do we do.

Q. Okay.

A. He advised me that we were going to carry on as normal. We were, at the time, we were still trying to preserve the liquidity and functioning of the broker-dealer, and as far as financing transactions, just to clarify, you

Page 28

Page 29

Page 27

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA

know, our involvement was to find collateral and those -- that financing by the Fed that you referred to was -- those programs are open to every broker-dealer, and every broker-dealer at the time -- the market was in a very, you know, as you know, very turbulent situation -- every broker-dealer was taking advantage of those programs so it was normal course for us to figure out what assets we could finance with the Fed that potentially wouldn't be financeable with other counterparties.

And that was our focus that week, was to try to locate all the collateral that we had available to finance that the Fed would deem acceptable in their programs.

Q. Okay. And so were you involved in the selection of the securities that were ultimately pledged to the Fed?

A. I wasn't involved in the selection of what was pledged to the Fed. I was involved in identifying assets which were not encumbered and could be used as collateral to be pledged to the Fed.

Q. Okay. And who actually selects which

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA collateral was pledged to the Fed?

A. The Fed programs are, at least the ones we used for financing, were tri-party transactions.

O. Right.

A. And the actual selection criteria itself was done by the tri-party agent.

O. Who was that?

A. JPChase. JPMorgan.

Q. And can you describe for me your role, if any, in supporting the financing that was provided by the Fed?

A. My role was to communicate between the -- between the trading desks and the tri-party operations groups and just coordinate, you know, the availability of collateral and the booking of the transactions which would ultimately represent that financing.

O. Okav.

A. So the trading desk basically books the transaction onto a system. My group's role is to ensure that that booking makes it all the way through the front-end booking system all the way through to the system that is the books and

Page 30 Page 31 1 1 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA 2 2 records and what transmits that transaction to shorthand. 3 3 our tri-party agent and that there's no A. That's fine. 4 discrepancies, everything matches with what the 4 O. So, to your knowledge, with respect to 5 5 traders know to have raised from a financing that Fed financing of the week of September 15, 6 6 perspective. Chase placed a value on the collateral that was 7 7 And then we coordinate with the used? 8 8 tri-party operations folks to make sure that A. That's correct. 9 there were no mechanical difficulties in the 9 Q. Did Lehman place its own value on that 0 allocation that's performed by the tri-party 10 collateral? 1 agent, that there wasn't any shortfalls of 11 MR. SHAW: Objection. Vague. 2 12 A. I don't know that -- Lehman, as a collateral and things of that nature, and then .3 1.3 normal broker-dealer would have their own marks report back to the trading desk. 14 4 Q. Do you have any involvement in how for collateral on their books and records. 5 15 that collateral is valued? Q. Right. 16 A. The final determinant of that 6 A. No. 7 17 collateral with respect to the financing O. Who does that? 18 transaction would be the responsibility of the 8 A. The tri-party agent. 19 9 O. And that would be Chase? tri-party agent. 20 20 O. Okay. And do you know if there's A. JPChase, yes. 21 Q. Does Lehman --21 any -- were there any differences in the 22 22 A. Going forward, should we just refer to valuations that Lehman would -- placed on that it as Chase? Because I'm not sure JPMorgan 23 23 collateral versus what Chase placed on that 24 collateral during that week? Chase, JPChase. 24 25 Q. That's fine. We'll use Chase as a 25 A. I don't know. Page 33 Page 32 1 1 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA 2 2 Q. Okay. Would you be involved in that A. I did not. 3 3 normally? O. Did you have any understanding that A. No. 4 the Asset Purchase Agreement called for the sale 4 5 5 Q. Okay. Before we go further on in that of \$70 billion in long positions to Barclays? 6 6 week, do you have any understanding of the 7 7 actual sale transaction, the terms of the sale Q. Had you ever heard that phrase used? 8 transaction between Lehman and Barclays? 8 A. No. That number is a completely new 9 9 number to anything I've had heard. A. No. I don't. 10 10 Q. Did you ever have a chance to look at O. You never heard that number during 11 what's known as the Asset Purchase Agreement? 11 that week? 12 A. No, I didn't. 12 A. During -- to this day. 13 13 Q. Did you ever have any understanding Q. Okay. I'm just trying to get a sense 14 about the terms of the transaction whereby 14 of what you were involved in. 15 Lehman assets were going to be transferred to 115 A. That's fine. Chase - I mean to Barclays? 16 O. Had you ever heard during that week 16 17 MR. SHAW: Objection to form. 117 that the transaction involved the transfer of 18 \$69 billion in short positions to Barclays? 18 A. At what point in time are you 19 19 A. No. referring to? 20 20 Q. Okay. Let's break it down. Early in Q. Okay. Going further on in the week, did there come a time when you learned some of 21 21 the week, Monday, Tuesday? 22 22 A. Of the week of the 15th? the terms of the transaction between Lehman and 23 23 Barclays? O. Of the week of the 15th. 24 Did you have any understanding of the 24 A. During that week, no. 25 Q. After moving to Barclays, have you terms of the deal between Lehman and Barclays?

Page 34 Page 35 1 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA 1 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA 2 learned some of the terms of the transaction 2 clearance or -- a location at a clearing bank, 3 3 such as a JPChase or Bank of New York, or it can between Lehman and Barclays? 4 refer to the record of your having those 4 A. At a much later time, yes. 5 5 accounts on your stock records. So basically O. What have you learned about it? 6 A. I learned that Barclays has purchased 6 your stock record represents your position of 7 those locations at those outside agents. So 7 the unencumbered assets -- the way I understand 8 it's used intermittently, depending upon the use 8 it is they purchased the unencumbered assets of 9 9 or the person using it. Lehman Brothers' clearance boxes. 0 Q. Anything else that Barclays purchased? 10 O. And what is your understanding of the 1 A. The building at 745. 11 amount or the value of the assets that were 12 2 transferred from Lehman to Barclays? O. Anything else? 13 .3 MR. SHAW: Objection. Just for A. No. 14 clarification, do you mean as unencumbered 4 Q. When you say "unencumbered assets," .5 15 assets or overall? what do you mean by that? 6 A. An unencumbered asset, from my 16 MR. HINE: Whatever assets he thinks. 17 O. Let me clarify that. Let's take out 7 perspective, as an operations professional, is 18 8 an asset which does not have a lien on it by any the real estate. 19 A. Okay. .9 other party, primarily customers. Q. What is your understanding of the 20 20 Q. And when you say "in the clearance boxes," what are you referring to? 21 21 value of the assets other than the real estate 22 2 A. Clearance boxes are -- it's a loose that were transferred from Lehman to Barclays? 23 23 term that can be defined in two ways: A A. At what point in time? 24 clearance box can be a location at a depository 24 Q. Now. 25 25 A. As of today? institution, such as DTC, or it can be a Page 37 Page 36 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA 1 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA 1 2 2 originally asked what had been transferred. O. Yes. A. As of today, my understanding is that 3 3 O. Right. 4 the value of unencumbered collateral that was 4 A. And based on, you know, transactions, 5 1.4 or so billion had been transferred. 5 transferred was approximately 1.4 billion. Q. Have you heard the term "Schedule B"? 6 6 O. Right. 7 7 A. There may have been a different total A. I have, yes. 8 O. And what is your understanding of what value on Schedule B. I can't be certain what that value is. There's been people who have 9 that is? 9 0 10 A. Schedule B, to my understanding, is talked about a number. the schedule of assets which were part of the 11 11 O. Okav. 2 A. So I have a general sense, but I 12 transaction between Barclays and Lehman 13 wouldn't testify that I knew a hundred percent 13 Brothers. 14 what that value of Schedule B was. 14 Q. And is the 1.4 billion that you just Q. Do you have any knowledge of what has 15 mentioned, is that the approximate amount of the .5 6 been called Schedule A with respect to that 16 assets on Schedule B? 17 transaction? 17 A. The 1.4 -- the short answer is I don't 18. 18 A. Schedule A, as I understood it, was know.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

related to a transaction prior to that

Lehman Brothers and Barclays.

I view those as distinctly different

transaction which was the financing between

Q. Okay. And do you have any --

A. I'm not sure, is it all part of the same transaction? I don't know that it's part.

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

Q. Okay.

A. You had asked me what had been

Originally, yes, because you

Q. Okay. Are you drawing a distinction

between transferred and some other -- other --

transferred to date. So what had been

transferred is approximately 1.4.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

3

4 5

6

7

9

10

11

12

.3

14

15

6

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 38

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA transactions. Schedule A and what became Schedule B, but...

- Q. Okay. Well, I just want to understand what your understanding is.
 - A. Okay.

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

0

1

2

.3

4

. 5

6

7

8 9

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

. 0

11

.2

.3

4

5

6

17

L 8

L 9

20

21

2

23

24

- O. So let me just try to understand. You mentioned a separate transaction between Barclays and Lehman that eventually led to a collection of securities that has been known as Schedule A; is that right?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. Okay. And what was the transaction that you understood took place that led to Schedule A?
- A. There was a secured financing transaction, a repo transaction -- from Lehman's perspective, it was a repo transaction with Barclays which took place on the 18th of September, and the assets related to that transaction became Schedule A.
- Q. Okay. And is it all right -- was that a tri-party repo?
- A. That transaction was a -- was a repo. There were -- it was sort of a unique

Page 40

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA tell me if I'm wrong here. There was a financing with the Fed in which there was a certain amount of collateral posted by Lehman,

correct?

A. That's correct.

Q. At some point in time, that collateral gets transferred to Chase? Withdrawn. Let me start again.

At some point in time that collateral gets transferred to Bank of New York in connection with this transaction you have just described?

- A. That's correct.
- Q. Okay. And were you involved in that transfer of collateral from the Fed program to Bank of New York?
 - A. I was, yes.
- Q. You were, okay. And did all the collateral make it from the Fed program to the Bank of New York?
 - A. It did not.
- Q. And do you know -- do you recall how much made it and how much didn't?
 - A. I can't give you the figure of exactly

Page 39

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA transaction. It was one that took on elements of tri-party as well as a bilateral contract, but it was governed under the documents of a tri-party repo, yes.

Q. And who is the agent with respect to that transaction?

A. There was -- well, that's what made it unique. There were two tri-party agents involved. There was Chase, who was a tri-party agent, who held our collateral with the Fed that we had pledged to the Federal Reserve, and then, in effecting the transaction, according to the tri-party terms, there was Bank of New York, who was the agent for Barclays.

O. I see reference in some of the documents to the BONY tri-party?

A. Uh-huh.

Q. Is that the tri-party we're -- is that the transaction we're talking about?

A. Yes, that's correct. We moved the assets from JPChase, who was our tri-party agent, to Bank of New York, who was, as I mentioned, Barclays' agent.

Q. Just so I understand the sequence,

Page 41

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA how much that was in the Fed program made it to Barclays of the original collateral because

there were difficulties in the collateral all moving over to Barclays.

I can tell you how much collateral,

approximately, made it to Barclays, but it wouldn't necessarily be all of the same collateral that was with the Fed.

Q. Okay. Did you mean to say Bank of New York or Barclays?

A. Well, it was to Barclays -- I'm sorry, to the Bank of New York for the benefit of Barclays.

Q. Okay. So how much made it to the Bank of New York in connection with that transfer from the Fed program?

A. On the night of the 18th, approximately \$42 billion worth of collateral.

Q. And that figure is based on a valuation of the collateral provided by who?

- A. By Bank of New York.
- O. So \$42 billion is how Bank of New York valued the amount of money -- the amount of collateral that was transferred from the Fed

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 42

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA program to it on the 18th?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

0

1

.2

.3

4

5

6

.7

8

9

0

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

A. From the Fed -- that was the way that they valued the collateral that was transferred to them, not necessarily just from the Fed, because as I mentioned earlier, not all from the Fed program, because there was collateral which was not part of the Fed program which was transferred to Barclays as well.

- Q. Okay. Can you explain to me generally -- I think I understand what you said, but where did the rest of the collateral come from that made it to Bank of New York?
- A. It was other unencumbered collateral in Lehman's clearance boxes.
- Q. Okay. Are you referring to what I've seen referred to as an O74 box?
- A. It was -- that was one of the sources of collateral, yes.
 - Q. Where else did it come from?
- A. It came from another DTC location, which was 636, and it also came from our government clearance location. Chase was also a government clearance custodian, so from our government clearance box.

Page 43

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA

- O. Does that have a number?
- A. It does, but it has an acronym number that I'm not familiar with off the top of my head.
- Q. Okay. So were you involved let me just -- I want to get a sense of your involvement now. You were involved in the transfer of collateral from the Fed program to Bank of New York, and were you then involved in the efforts to unwind that September 18 repo arrangement?
- A. Unwind from the perspective of a deal negotiation or unwind from the perspective of the mechanics of --
- Q. I'm trying to get a sense of what your involvement was. What did you do, after the collateral made it to Bank of New York, what was your role in connection with getting that collateral eventually to Barclays?
- A. We didn't have any more involvement with getting that collateral to Barclays. Once Bank of New York took possession of it --
 - Q. Uh-huh.
 - -- Bank of New York got the collateral

Page 44

Page 45

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA to Barclays.

- Q. Okay. Did you have any role in preparing what has been called Schedule A with respect to that collateral?
- A. I did not prepare Schedule A. What I -- what I did provide is I provided information which reflected the assets that Lehman knew to have transferred to Barclays in respect to that transaction, or to Bank of New York for the benefit of Barclays.
- Q. Okay. Well, from September 18 through that weekend, I think I've seen in some documents some efforts to find additional assets that were eventually going to be transferred to Barclays: is that correct?
 - A. That is correct.
- O. And were you involved in that effort to locate additional assets that were going to be transferred to Barclays?
 - A. I was, yes.
- Q. What did you do in connection with that?
- A. I pretty much performed the same role. I looked across the stock record for assets that

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA didn't have liens on them by customers, primarily.

- Q. Okay. How many assets were located in that effort?
- A. I don't know a specific number. I know there were -- there were significant number of individual securities which were located.
- O. Okay. Was that securities that came out of the O74 box and 636 box?
- A. Those were securities that, yes, out of O74 and 636, yes.
- Q. Previously you had said there were \$42 billion transferred to Bank of New York. Did that include assets from the O74 and 636 box?
 - A. On the night of the 18th?
 - Q. Yes.
- A. Yes, those assets were sourced from those two boxes as well, yes.
- Q. Okay. And then were there -- is it correct to say there were additional assets found over the weekend in those two boxes that were also later sent to Barclays?
- A. At a later date, yes, there were assets from those two boxes that were sent.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

0

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 46

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA

Q. So when you add up all these assets that were eventually made their way to Barclays, do you have a number that would reflect the value of those assets?

A. I don't know what the value of those assets are today. I know that there was a value assigned to the assets on the night of the 18th for what made it, which were -- what was \$42 billion. My approximate evaluation of what was subsequently transferred was about 1.4 billion of physically moving from Lehman to Barclays.

So those are the two figures that I'm reasonably comfortable with. And the market valuation of those things has been changing over time, being that it's a year later and things like that.

- Q. I just want to get a -- just so I understand your perspective on this, from your perspective, there was \$42 billion moved to Bank of New York which eventually makes its way to Barclays, correct?
 - A. That's correct.

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

0

11

L2

13

14

15

16

17

.8

9

20

21

22

23

24

Q. And there's a separate amount of 1.4 billion which is gathered sometime late in the

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA week and that eventually makes it to Barclays as well, correct?

- A. That's correct.
- O. And is the 1.4 billion what's called Schedule B?
 - A. The 1.4 --

MR. SHAW: Objection. Asked and answered. Mischaracterizes prior testimony. MR. HINE: I didn't say anything about his prior testimony.

- Q. I'm just trying to figure out, do you consider the 1.4 billion the assets that are on Schedule B?
- A. I have subsequently learned that the 1.4 billion are assets that are on Schedule B,
- Q. And were you involved in preparing Schedule B?
- A. I was not involved in preparing the official Schedule B. I provided assets which were used as the securities that would be later selected and placed on Schedule B, but I didn't prepare the official Schedule B.
 - Q. Who selected the assets ultimately

Page 48

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA that would become part of Schedule B?

- A. I provided that information through my manager at the time. I don't recall whether I had sent it to Monty or to Alastair, but nonetheless, they forwarded it to Paolo Tonucci and I believe Paolo sort of crystallized the official Schedule B.
- Q. Is it fair to say over that weekend your role was to just find unencumbered assets that they could possibly decide what to do with?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. Okay. Did you have an understanding of why you were doing that?
 - A. No.
- Q. Did anyone tell you that there was any kind of shortfalls in what Barclays was expecting to receive at the end of that week?
- A. My understanding at the time was that I was still trying to complete the repo transaction, and part of that repo transaction was we had placed cash as well as an asset to Barclays, and, you know, my understanding at the time was that I was looking to, in addition to -- I was looking for assets that would be

Page 49

Page 47

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA able to be sent to Barclays for the purposes of also substituting that cash.

- Q. When you say the repo transaction, are you talking about the September 18 transaction that we previously discussed?
 - A. Involving the Federal Reserve, yes.
- Q. I think I just misunderstood you. The September 18 transaction was between Barclays, Lehman and BONY, right?
- A. It was Barclays, Lehman and BONY, but it was -- well, yes, it was Lehman. It was basically like I guess a transaction where I guess the collateral that Lehman had on finance with the Fed was being -- instead now being financed with Barclays and Barclays was then I guess going to finance that transaction with the Fed. So that's why I referenced the Fed.
- Q. Okay. When you said you were concerned with the repo at that time, what were you doing with respect to the repo? Again, I'm talking Friday of that week.
- A. Friday of that week, I -- it was my understanding that we were looking to substitute the cash that we had placed on deposit for the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

0

.1

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 50

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA

- benefit of Barclays with assets as opposed to leaving cash, because it's not efficient from a lending transaction to collateralize a cash loan with cash. So we were looking to find available assets which were suitable under the repo agreement to substitute.
 - Q. How much cash are we talking about?
- A. On the night of the 18th, Lehman Brothers placed \$7 billion on deposit for the benefit of Barclays.
- Q. Just so I understand it, in layman's terms -- well, before I ask that, let me -- was that cash part of the \$42 billion that you mentioned?
- A. It was not. 42 billion was the value of the assets, physical securities, that had made it to Bank of New York for the benefit of Barclays.
- Q. And so there was \$7 billion in cash on top of that?
 - A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

ÞЗ

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

0

11

12

13

14

15

. 6

17

.8

19

bo

21

22

23

24

Q. And so am I correct to say you were trying to locate other assets that could be transferred to Barclays so Lehman could keep the

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA

- A. The morning of the 19th, Chase had effectively shut down our clearing accounts and stopped having communication with anything other than I think some very senior folks in Lehman Brothers.
 - Q. And why did they do that? MR. SHAW: Objection. Foundation.
- A. I don't know particularly why they do that. I mean, there was, you know, there was some speculation as to why they did that because of the status of our situation from a credit perspective and things like that, but I don't know if there was a particular trigger that caused them to do that.
- Q. Did you have any conversation with folks at Chase about this?
 - A. On the morning of the 19th, no.
 - O. At any time?
- A. I mean, I had conversations with folks at Chase all through the night on the 18th, actually, technically, I guess into the morning of the 19th while we were trying to finalize the transaction. And after the morning of the 19th, I guess the very early morning, like in the 1, 2

Page 51

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA cash portion?

- A. So, yes, Lehman could get a return of the cash in lieu of assets. So a substitution of one asset for another.
- Q. And were you able to come up with any assets to do that?
 - A. Yes, I was. On Friday.
 - Q. How much?
- A. Approximately a billion, just a little over a billion. Something like a billion-34, -35, something along those lines.
- O. Okay. And did those assets in fact get substituted in and make their way to Barclays?
- A. Well, they made their way into Barclays. My expectation of a return of the cash never occurred.
 - Q. Why is that?
- A. Well, with the mechanics and everything that happened with the relationship with Chase that day, Chase didn't return any of the cash at that point.
- O. Can you explain to me the problems you had with the relationship with Chase that day?

Page 53

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA o'clock range, that was the last conversation I had with anybody at Chase.

O. What was that about?

A. That was primarily about --The last conversation or the last series of conversations?

O. Last series of conversations?

- A. The last series of conversations were in relation to securing a loan to create the \$7 billion which we placed on deposit with Barclays.
- O. I see something referred to in the documents as a box loan. Is that the loan you're talking about?
- A. The 7 billion was a box loan, yeah. Lehman took a box loan from Chase and let -- as a result, Chase puts a lien on the assets for that \$7 billion in cash, yes.
 - Q. What assets was that lien on?
- A. There were assets which were unencumbered assets sitting in Lehman's clearance boxes at Chase.
- O. Is that an identifiable set of assets that now has a lien on them from Chase?

Page 54 Page 55 1 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA 1 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA 2 MR. SHAW: When you say "now," you 2 repo rates with respect to the Fed financing? 3 3 A. Schedules of rates, no. mean as we sit here? 4 Q. So you don't -- I think you just said 4 Q. As a result of that box loan, is there 5 now a lien on a particular set of assets, 5 you don't know the repo rate for that Fed 6 identifiable set of assets in Lehman's box? 6 financing program? 7 MR. SHAW: Objection to form. 7 A. Well, to be clear, there was more than 8 8 A. Chase, in extending the loan to us, one program. selected the assets that they thought suitable 9 Q. Right. 9 10 10 for collateralization on that loan. A. And I didn't know the rates on any of Q. Did Lehman have any say in the 11 11 the programs. 12 selection of those assets? 12 O. What was the repo rate on the September 18 transaction we've been talking 13 13 A. No. 1.4 Q. Let me go back. I think I have a 14 about? 15 general sense of what you were working on at the 15 A. I don't recall. 16 time. I just want to go back with a couple of 16 Q. What is a repurchase price with 17 particular questions. 17 respect to a repo? 18 I wanted to go back to the Fed 18 MR. SHAW: Objection. Calls for a 19 19 legal conclusion, but you can answer. financing for a minute. Do you know what the 20 repo rate was for that financing? 20 THE WITNESS: Okay. A. I don't know. 21 A. A repurchase price -- a repo 21 22 transaction is a collateralized loan. It's 22 Q. What is a repo rate? 23 23 based on an initial sale of collateral and a A. A repo rate is the rate of interest 24 that you pay for the extension of the cash loan. 24 repurchase of collateral. The price of that 25 Q. Have you ever seen any schedules of 25 collateral on both, what are called both legs, Page 57 Page 56 1 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA 1 2 O. And they also received \$7 billion in 2 which is the on leg, or start leg, or the off 3 cash pursuant to the box loan, right? 3 leg, or maturity leg, are the same thing. So the repurchase price would have been the price 4 A. That's correct. 4 5 Q. What did Barclays give to Lehman? 5 that was assigned to that collateral on the Barclays gave to Lehman \$45 billion of 6 start of the transaction. There's no difference 6 A. 7 7 between the repurchase price and the initial cash. 8 8 Q. And is that the price that you were price. 9 just referring to when you talked about the 9 Q. What was the, just -- what was the 10 .0 initial price on the September 18 repo we've on --. 1 been talking about? 11 A. No. 12 Q. Okay. 2 A. Well --13 A. That's the -- that's what's known as 13 MR. SHAW: Objection. Foundation. 4 A. There were, if you're asking me about 14 the repo principal or the loan amount. 15 Q. Okay. And so how is that different 15 prices, prices of securities, there were prices from the prices you were just talking about? 16 on something along the lines of 10,000 6 17 A. Prices are the prices of the 17 securities. So... 18 underlying collateral that securitized that 18 Q. No, I'm asking the aggregate price on 19 loan. L 9 the September 18 repo. Am I correct to say 20 Q. And how are they different from the 20 that --21 principal of the loan? 21 A. Well, it --22 22 A. The principal of the loan is the O. -- Barclays, through bank of New York extension of the dollar amount or what the 23 23 on behalf of Barclays, received collateral value -- what the value of cash that's being valued at \$42 billion, correct? 24 24 extended is. That's the loan principal. 25 Right. A.

Page 58

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA

Q. Right.

.0

.1

.3

.5

. 7

. 8

A. The price, the prices, are the prices of the individual collateral that make up that loan, and in order for a loan to be effective, the value of the price times the par amount of the collateral should exceed the principal extended.

Q. Okay. Is that what's known as the haircut, the amount by which it exceeds?

A. The amount by which it would exceed the loan is known as the haircut, that's correct.

Q. And so what was the haircut associated with the September 18 repo?

- A. There wasn't a -- there wasn't a specific stated haircut. There was a total loan amount, which was this \$45 billion, and the total collateral value that we were trying to transfer over to Barclays or what we were directed to transfer over to Barclays was approximately \$50 billion.
- Q. And that \$50 billion was comprised of the approximately \$42 billion in securities that you mentioned earlier plus the cash?

Page 59

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA

- A. It turned out that that was the case. It was initially intended to be all collateral, but the market value of what we were to transfer initially was \$50 billion.
- Q. Okay. And Barclays was, after the -after they received the proceeds of the loan and
 the collateral, was Barclays satisfied that it
 had received the entire amount of collateral
 that it was expecting with respect to that repo?

MR. SHAW: Objection. Foundation.

- A. Yeah, I don't know whether they were satisfied or not. I mean, we completed the securities transfers until the point that we couldn't make any transfers because the system had been shut down, and we were requested at that point to deliver an additional 7 billion in cash, which we did.
- Q. Okay. When was that transferred, approximately?
 - A. The 7 billion in cash?
 - Q. Yes.
- A. Somewhere between 2 and 3 o'clock in the morning on the 19th.
 - Q. Friday?

Page 60

age 60

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA

Page 61

Q. So that makes the haircut approximately \$5 billion?

A. That would be correct.

Q. Do you know what the haircut was for the Fed program earlier in that week?

A. I don't. Again, the haircut, each security class had its own individual haircut, so there would have been a, I guess what's called a synthetic haircut, which, you know, would equate to something similar to what you did there, you know, so -- and I believe it was similar because the transaction was described to me as we were going to take the extension of financing that the Fed had offered to Lehman and we were going to help effect the transfer of that to Barclays so that Barclays could then step back into that transaction. So I believe it was similar. I don't know exactly what the haircut was.

Q. Okay. And who described the transaction to you like that?

A. John Rodefeld, who was held of North American Operations at the time, had contacted Alastair and myself to talk about the

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA

A. Well, it was -- it was -- we worked through the night of the 18th. So I guess it was very, very early in the 19th. So it was the morning of the 19th at like maybe 2 o'clock in the morning or something like that.

- Q. So, back to the notion of a haircut, the haircut for that transaction is the difference between the approximate \$50 billion in collateral and cash that was transferred to Bank of New York and the 45 billion that Barclays transferred to Lehman, correct?
- A. Could you repeat that one more time? I'm sorry.
- Q. I'm just trying to figure out what the haircut is for that transaction. I thought you said that approximately 50 billion was transferred to Bank of New York or Barclays?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. In the form of either collateral or cash?
 - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. And that Barclays gave Lehman 45 billion in cash?
 - A. Right, that's correct.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

. 0

.1

12

13

14

.5

L 6

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 62

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA transaction.

Q. And what did he say about it?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

L 0

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

0

. 1

2

. 3

L 4

.5

6

17

8.

9

bo.

b.1

2

23

24

A. He basically told us that Barclays had been contacted by the Fed and Barclays was asked to provide a credit, a counterparty credit upgrade to the Fed, in essence. They were fine with financing the collateral basket that they were financing, but they would prefer not to have Lehman as a counterparty on the other side of that.

They asked Barclays to basically intermediate a transaction where Barclays offered Lehman the same financing that they had been -- that the Fed had been financing with them throughout that week, and then that Barclays would take that collateral and place it back on deposit with the Fed to make them whole on the cash transaction.

Q. I think I understand what you just said.

What else did Mr. Rodefeld say on that call?

A. Well, that call was on the 17th, and they initially were looking to actually effect

Page 63

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA that transaction the same day on the 17th. And then, you know, with some subsequent conversations, it just became -- it basically became an impossibility not just for Lehman Brothers, but for Bank of New York, JPChase, Barclays to do a transaction of that magnitude in the course of a day.

So from the 17th through the -basically the whole 17th into the night of the 17th and even morning of the early 18th, we discussed the mechanics on how we would effect that transfer in the most efficient manner.

Q. So do you recall anything else about what Mr. Rodefeld told you on that call?

A. Not other than what I just described to vou.

Q. So am I correct to say that the initial intent was to have this transaction take place on the Wednesday of that week?

A. From the first phone call, yes, it was intended to take place on Wednesday, but...

Q. And just why mechanically was that not possible?

There were numerous reasons from each

Page 64

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA

of the parties. Purely from the size of the transaction, it was an extremely large transaction, and the number of securities involved were in the multiple thousand range, you know, I would say in the double-digit thousand range. So that was one of the issues.

So not just from a transactional perspective, but also from a static perspective on the Bank of New York's side, they didn't have a lot of these securities set up on their systems. It was going to take them time to set the securities up to be able to set up receipts for these securities and things along that nature.

Q. So how was it possible to do it on Thursday as opposed to Wednesday?

A. People were working 24 hours a day to get it done and bunches of people were brought in to help set things up and there were technologists brought in on all different sides to help do away from ordinary type transactions and things like that to get the securities transferred.

Q. So am I correct to say that you

Page 65

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA

learned of the possibility of this transaction sometime on Wednesday, late Wednesday, and then people worked through Wednesday night and then all the way through Thursday night to get it done?

A. That's correct.

O. Okay. Did the nature of that transfer change at all? In other words -- let me rephrase that.

You just described what Mr. Rodefeld told you about the transaction. Did that transaction change at all over the course of that Wednesday into Thursday?

MR. SHAW: Objection. Foundation.

A. The nature of the transaction itself, the spirit of the transaction, nothing changed, no.

Q. Okay. That makes sense.

A. Could I -- I apologize. (Discussion off the record.) (Recess; Time Noted: 10:31 A.M.) (Time Noted: 10:38 A.M.

BY MR. HINE:

Q. Mr. Hraska, I just want to take a

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

h 1

12

13

14

15

16

117

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

Page 66

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA second to just talk again about your understanding of the transaction between Barclays and Lehman.

Did you ever have any understanding that there was supposed to be a discount associated with that transaction?

- A. Which transaction? The repo transaction?
- Q. No. No, the sale transaction between Barclays and Lehman.
- A. I didn't have any knowledge as to what the terms of that transaction were.
- Q. Did you ever hear the phrase "block discount" used in connection with either that transaction or the repo that we have been talking about?
 - A. No.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

0

. 1

.2

.3

. 4

. 5

6

.7

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

.5

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

0

.1

.2

. 3

4

. 5

. 6

. 7 . 8

9

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Did you ever have any understanding that Barclays was going to be paying less than full value for the assets that it was buying from Lehman?
 - A. No.
- Q. Did you ever hear any discussion about the possibility of defaulting on the repo that

Page 67

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA we have been discussing?

- A. There was discussions related to that topic on the week of the 22nd.
- Q. Tell me what you recall about that, those discussions.
- A. Well, there was -- it was news that obviously LBI had filed for I guess SIPC protection. So the margin folks had contacted me on the morning of -- I don't know which morning, I believe it was on the 22nd, but if not, on the 23rd, to ask me if that transaction was being considered a default by Barclays. And at the time, I didn't know, but there was -- I then had conversations about whether that was going to be treated as default with my manager, and at the time, you know, we didn't actually know when it was or if it was going to be treated as in default.
- Q. When we talk about "it," we're talking about the September 18 repo?
 - A. Repo itself, yes.
- Q. And LBI filed for bankruptcy on Friday, the 19th?
 - A. That's my understanding.

Page 68

_

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA

- Q. And so you had conversations the following Monday about this?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And who were the conversations with?
- A. I don't recall specifically. Somebody from the Margin Group. I don't recall specifically who it was from the Margin Group that I had a conversation with. And I also had a conversation with Monty Forrest, which is my manager.
 - Q. The Margin Group at Barclays?
- A. The Margin Group at legacy Lehman Brothers.
- Q. Do you recall the names of the individuals that you spoke to?
 - A. No, I just said I didn't recall it.
- Q. To your understanding, was the September 18 repo unwound in some way?
- A. To my understanding, it was defaulted and the collateral that was put up to securitize that loan was seized by Bank of New York for the benefit of Barclays.
- Q. Okay. And did Bank of New York also seize the cash that had been posted?

Page 69

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA

MR. SHAW: Objection. Foundation.

- A. The cash itself was not in an account that or in a position for Bank of New York to seize. The cash itself was being held for the benefit of Barclays at JPChase.
 - Q. Okay. And what happened to that cash? MR. SHAW: Foundation.
- A. Barclays, because the cash was put into the account of their benefit, they -- later I understood, and it would make sense, that they claimed ownership of that cash. What happened to the cash after that, I sort of was removed from the transaction after they laid ownership claim to that cash.
- Q. Okay. I guess do you understand that there was an ensuing dispute between Chase and Barclays as to the ownership of that cash, among other things?
 - A. I did, yes.
- Q. And were you involved in that resolution of that dispute?
 - A. My only -- not in the resolution, no.
- Q. What was your involvement in connection with that dispute?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

. 0

11

.2

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 70

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA

A. To do some fact-finding to describe how that cash --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

.0

. 1

2

.3

. 5

6

7

8

9

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

.0

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. SHAW: Actually, let me just stop you here. If this was any work you did for counsel, I don't want you to get into the details of it.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

A. It was purely to describe how that cash got there, why was there cash in a repo transaction.

Q. And who were you describing that for?

A. My initial conversation on that was with -- was with the Treasury folks, and that was more so just to -- was more so just to review sort of what happened on that evening and --

Q. When you say "the Treasury folks," are you talking about Mr. Tonucci?

- A. Mr. Tonucci and his organization, yeah.
- Q. Okay. And so am I understanding you correctly that you explained to them the genesis of the box loan that we just previously discussed and how the cash came to be involved

Page 71

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA in that transaction?

- A. Yes.
- O. And did you have any other involvement in the dispute between Barclays and Chase over that cash?
 - A. No.
- Q. Okay. I would like to revisit some of the things we talked about earlier.

There was a pool of collateral that was used to secure the Fed financing early in the week, correct?

- A. That's correct.
- Q. And I think you told me you weren't aware of the value of that pool; is that right?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. At some point that pool was supposed to be transferred to Bank of New York for the benefit of Barclays, but not all of it makes it, right?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. And now do you know why it didn't make it, that portion of it didn't make it?
- A. There were multiple reasons why not all the collateral made it.

Page 72

Page 73

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA

O. Can you tell me what they are?

A. I can tell you the ones that I'm aware of. I may not tell you every reason, but ...

The first reason was that some of the collateral that was pledged to the Bank of New York -- I'm sorry, that was pledged to the Fed was obtained through a program called GCF, which stands for General Collateral Financing.

Q. Uh-huh.

A. As a result of this program, you obtain collateral. It's basically it's a dealer-to-dealer tri-party program. So you obtain collateral, which is credited on a book-entry-only basis to your clearing bank, and that clearing bank -- you can use that collateral to -- you can basically rehypothecate that collateral. You can use it as collateral for an ongoing transaction.

The transference of that collateral is purely governed by the Fixed Income Clearing Corporation, or FICC, in conjunction with the two clearing banks, Bank of New York and JPChase. So when a transaction is agreed and it's put on and when it's unwound, what happens

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA is is that the transference of that collateral is purely governed, as I mentioned, by FICC.

And so we had previously purchased collateral under that program and we were using some of that collateral purchased under that program, and when the morning of the 18th hit, some of those programs had matured, and as a result of that maturity, that collateral was taken out of our clearance boxes on an automated fashion away from us having any involvement in or being able to even stop that. Because just as part of the program, collateral comes in and goes out.

So what was previously sourced from that program and listed as a rehypothecated asset to the Fed on the morning of the 18th was no longer available for us to actually transfer to Bank of New York.

Q. And do you know the value of the collateral that was -- falls into that category?

A. I don't know the value of specifically the GCF collateral. I know that there was -- it was a significant value. There was a value of -- GCF collateral is typically Fed-eligible

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 74

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA collateral. We had a discrepancy of approximately 8 billion in Fed-eligible collateral, but I don't know whether that discrepancy -- I can't say for certain whether that discrepancy was purely related to GCF or not.

Q. When you say 8 billion, is that the amount that didn't make it from the Fed program to the Bank of New York?

- A. That was the amount at the time when we tried to effect the transfer of the Cusips that were out there that we were unable to transfer on the 18th.
- Q. And so am I correct to say there was approximately \$8 billion in collateral that was not able to transfer on the 18th from the Fed program to Bank of New York; is that right?
 - A. Yeah, initially, yes.
- Q. Okay. And a portion of that 8 billion wasn't able to transfer due to this --
 - A. GCF.
 - Q. GCF issue that you just described?
- A. Yes.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

117

18

119

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

.0

11

.2

1.3

14

. 5

16

17

. 8

9

20

21

22

23

24

Q. Do you know what portion of it falls

Page 75 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA

into that category?

- A. I don't, unfortunately.
- Q. Do you know if it's most of it or only a small portion?
- A. I don't think it's most of it, but it's somewhere between most and small. It's probably somewhere in midrange. I don't honestly know.
 - Q. I'm not trying to get you --
- A. It's not insignificant, but I don't think it's most of it.
- Q. So that leaves another portion of the 8 billion that didn't make it. Why did the rest of it not make it?
- A. All right. So there were other things that were happening on that day. Collateral over securities that were moving were securities that were also traded by our inventory traders, proprietary traders at Lehman. They were also securities that, you know, customers maybe were asking to move out of their accounts and move to other broker-dealers.

When all these transactions take place, there are a queue of deliveries that get

Page 76

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA

Page 77

Q. Did those securities, I think I understood what you said, they got used for other purposes, basically, and is that -- does that relate to the winding down of the matched book that was managed by the Finance Department, the Financial Department within Lehman?

A. I wouldn't attribute it to a winding down of the matched book. All I can say is that there were -- there were trades booked in the system that were, you know, outward-going deliveries. They could have multiple sources.

So, as the securities came in, they just made on those deliveries and they could have multiple reasons why they were pending for delivery.

Q. I think you were describing reasons that some of the collateral didn't make it to BONY. Are there any other reasons?

A. There is one other reason in my mind that was a reason of the initial -- there was an initial shortfall, right? And that was because we were initially going to do the transfer in increments of \$5 billion, and Barclays had forwarded the first \$5 billion and our tri-party

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA

built out of the delivery boxes, and when there becomes availability, there's no way without manually intervening in every single delivery to say, okay, wait a minute, this Security A goes to Customer A and Security A goes to Customer B or C.

So what was happening, unfortunately, is many of the securities that were going -that had deliveries onward to Bank of New York for the benefit of Barclays also had onward delivery instructions for other people as well. So when the availability -- when the securities became available, some of those securities were first delivered to other onward obligations.

Q. Do you know approximately how the amount of securities that fall into that category?

A. I don't. I actually have no idea on that because that was -- that was a non-stop request of, you know, customer transfers, new trades and, you know, inventory traders were trying to sell assets to raise cash. So it was just an enormous amount of transactions in a particular time period.

.3

Page 78

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA agent was then, upon receipt of that \$5 billion, supposed to released \$5 billion worth of collateral that was previously held in the Fed program.

.0

1 2

.0

L2

L3

L 5

L 8

They had sent in a request to Lehman Brothers, "they" being JPChase sent in a request to Lehman Brothers as to which securities -- or did we have a preference as to which securities were released first. The response back was there was no particular order that needs to be released first. However, just release the securities that are in the program.

Unfortunately, there was a miscommunication and JPChase understood that to be any \$5 billion, and it released also some securities that were not in the program.

Q. When you say "the program," you're talking about --

A. "The program," meaning that were being financed by the Fed the previous evening.

Q. And so I interrupted your story, but continue.

A. So, as a result of that release, those securities had some onward obligations as well

Page 79

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA because they were subject to other transactions, as we described earlier, and those securities as well had gone out away from Bank of New York, and as a result of all these different things taking place, the first delivery of collateral only accomplished somewhere in the neighborhood of around probably 2 billion or less.

Q. Can you explain that? I mean Chase thinks they're releasing 5 billion?

A. Uh-huh.

Q. And only 2 billion or less makes it to BONY?

A. Right.

Q. And how does the rest get diverted? Just automatic?

A. Well, per the process we just talked about, those assets get released to our availability, and because there were pending deliveries in our clearance locations at both DTC, 636, O74, the Fed box, when those securities became available, they were immediately delivered on other obligations and they weren't available any more to be delivered to Bank of New York.

Page 80

Page 81

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA

Q. So, just to continue the story, Chase thinks it's delivering 5 billion, but they get diverted to other purposes and only a little less than 2 billion makes it to BONY out of that first delivery?

A. Chase releases their lien on 5 billion, and as a result, yes, Lehman, through it's clearance relationships, only delivered 2 billion. I think it was under 2 billion, but I just don't -- somewhere under 2 billion I think is the figure.

Q. So what happens next?

A. At that point in time we were contacted by John Rodefeld, who was representing operations at Barclays. He said we were going to suspend -- we were going to suspend the next increment of \$5 billion in cash being wired because Barclays didn't feel comfortable in wiring another 5 billion when they hadn't fully received the assets on the first 5 billion, and he asked us to hold off until we heard back from him with further instructions.

Q. And did you eventually get further instructions?

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA

A. We did very late in the day, I would say somewhere in the neighborhood of between 4 and 5 o'clock. He said that it was decided that Barclays was going to extend the remainder of the loan balance in a single transaction, which would have been the \$40 billion, and at that point in time, you know, expect to have, you know, Chase release the availability of the remaining 40 billion, I think, or of 40 billion that they had, and we were asked to coordinate with the clearance folks, to the best that they could, to try to monitor assets going and give priority of the assets to Barclays.

And that was -- it was a difficult task, but they, you know, they brought in extra people and tried to watch deliveries and that kind of thing. It was all on a manual basis so it was very difficult to do that, but they did the best they could with, you know, being that it was manual in nature.

Q. Why, if Chase was -- I mean, if -- excuse me. If Barclays was concerned about not sending the next 5 billion, why did they decide to go ahead and send 40 billion instead?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

0

11

12

13

4

.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

Page 82

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA

A. I honestly don't know.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

0

.1

2

.3

4

. 5

.6

7

8

9

20

21

2

23

24

5

1

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

. 0

1

.2

.3

4

.5

.6

7

.9

20

21

2

23

24

- Q. And so were you eventually successful in releasing the remainder of the collateral that Barclays was expecting?
- A. Well, as we discussed a little bit earlier, the -- we did manage to get over a total of 42 billion out of the 50 billion in collateral that we were expecting to send over.
- Q. Okay. Am I correct to say that 42 billion -- they had 2 billion from the initial release from Chase and then so there was an additional 40 transferred over?
 - A. Rough approximation, that's correct.
- Q. So now you're continuing to tell me the reasons that not all the Fed collateral made it to BONY. Are there any other reasons that vou know of?
 - A. No, those are the primary items.
 - Q. Okav.
- A. At least the ones that I was aware of. There might have been something else that I'm not aware of.
- Q. I believe you said that approximately 8 billion did not make it from the Fed program

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA to Bank of New York, correct?

- A. There was, yes, that's correct.
- Q. And so I know you don't know the exact numbers, but is 3 billion of that 8 billion the result of this initial shortfall problem that you just described?
- A. I wouldn't have any way to determine that.
- Q. I thought you said the initial release from Chase was supposed to be 5 billion and only about 2 billion made it to BONY out of that release; is that right?
 - A. That's correct.
 - Q. So --

A. But I don't know if what you're asking me is the -- is the 3 billion shortfall comprised of, you know, these GCF and whatever assets. I don't know what percentage of that was GCF or other deliveries or other transactions. That's, unfortunately, I have no way of knowing that.

O. Okay. Was any of the 8 billion shortfall later transferred to BONY?

A. Well, what was transferred was a total

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA of 42 billion. I mean, there was 8 billion of the Fed program, and those were Fed -- we probably need to make a distinction between the Fed program securities and what are deemed Fed wirable or Fed securities, right?

So there was, you know, what was held in the program, which were DTC-eligible securities, Fed wirable securities and that kind of thing. So the 8 billion shortfall, it was not only a shortfall of what was in the Fed program, it was basically a shortfall of Fed wirable security types.

So we found substitutes of a good portion of that 8 billion. I couldn't tell you the exact quantities, but that's why we were able to, you know, to manage to get, you know, a good portion of the collateral over to Bank of New York.

Q. I think I understood what you just said, but let me see if I can see if I got that right.

\$8 billion does not make it for any number of reasons to the BONY in the course of this transfer over Thursday night, and are you

Page 85

Page 83

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA saying ---

A. Well, let me clarify that. 8 billion that was initially intended to be transferred --

Q. Right.

A. -- was not going to be eligible to be transferred for various reasons.

- Q. Okay. Then you relayed that 42 billion in securities ultimately did make it to BONY, right?
 - A. Uh-huh. Yes, that's correct.
- O. Now, was some of that 42 substitute securities for the 8 billion?
 - A. Yes, it was.
 - Do you know how much?

A. I don't. I mean, we managed to make up as much as we could. I don't know the percentages of what was substituted from the original 8. I mean, at that point we knew 8 and there were other things that were causing problems. And then the goal became you need to get the \$50 billion worth of collateral over and make sure you get every collateral that doesn't have lien on it or unencumbered collateral that's eligible for the Barclays transaction

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

0

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

Page 86

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA over there.

So, you know, it stopped being about this pool or that pool or this type of collateral or that type of collateral. You know, there were specific, you know, buckets and things, but at a certain point in time, we were instructed by John Rodefeld to deliver all eligible collateral that fit the criteria to Barclays in as most efficient, quick manner as possible.

- Q. I had one question. I know we're talking round numbers here, but if you were supposed to deliver 50 and you delivered 42, how does the 7 billion box loan make up the entire difference? Was there -- seems to be another billion dollars missing.
- A. Again, it was 42 and change that made it and there was I think it might have been just under 50. It was 49 and some mid to high change.
 - Q. So the --

1

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

. 0

11

12

13

15

16

117

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

0

11

13

14

L 5

16

h 7

8

9

20

21

22

23

24

- A. You know, what's a half a billion between friends?
 - Q. So I just want to make sure I wasn't

Page 87

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA missing a billion here or there.

- A. No. No.
- O. It's really the 50 billion that was supposed to make it, made it in the form of approximately 42 and change --
 - A. Yeah.
- O. in securities, and the balance was the box loan?
 - A. Yes. that's correct.
- O. What securities were used to secure the box loan?
- A. I don't know the specific securities. I'm sure that could be provided by --
 - Q. Well--

A. I mean, if you're asking me like -- I think we talked a little bit about this before. There were securities which were unencumbered still at our clearance box at Chase. So Chase looked at the securities that were available and said, you know, you have market value that, you know, far exceed 7 billion.

So we requested a loan. They, you know -- we basically booked the transaction for a 7 billion loan on our books and Chase went

Page 88

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA ahead and allocated securities that they deemed appropriate that were being held in their clearance box.

- Q. Am I correct to say that the assets used to secure that box loan had nothing to do with the assets you have just described that were supposed to go from the Fed program to BONY?
- A. I wouldn't know specifically whether there were any circumstances where there might have been a Cusip that was or a security that was the same that were on the initial intended list. It's possible. I wouldn't know for sure.
- O. Okay. I see reference in some of the documents to something called fails on around Thursday. What is that term meant to entail, in your understanding?
 - A. The general term "fails" or --
- Q. Well, I see it in the Thursday night e-mail traffic, and I just wondered how that term is used in connection with what we're just talking about, if at all.
- A. Okay. Well, a fail is an interesting term, actually. It, for most operations

Page 89

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA professionals, a security transaction is booked, and until the point of delivery, it's considered a fail.

So that may mean if I book a transaction let's call it last night, 8 o'clock in the morning I haven't delivered it yet, it's still failing. You know, I may make delivery by the end of the day, and at that point, you know, it becomes cleaned up.

Other people in the industry refer to fails as, you know, after settlement date, but from an operations perspective, which is probably a good part of the mail you see, fails are related to undelivered securities at a particular point in time.

So on that day we had a enormous amount, as we talked about those, sort of those trades that were queued up before that I referenced, those were all pending deliveries or fails. So over the course of time, as availability -- as securities became available, those fails were getting cleaned up. So there were --

Q. Okay.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

0

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 90

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA

(Exhibit 137B, a document bearing Bates Nos. 10294679 with attached spreadsheets, marked for identification, as of this date.)

Q. Mr. Hraska, I'm handing you a copy of a document marked as Exhibit 137B, which is an e-mail chain from September 18, 2008, on which you are a CC recipient, and attached to it is a spreadsheet and sheet of some sort.

Please take a minute to look at it and I have a question or two about the spreadsheet.

A. Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

0

.1

.2

.3

4

.5

6

.7

. 8

. 9

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

(Document review.)

- A. Okay.
- Q. Have you had a chance to look at the document?
 - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. I know we were talking about fails previously, so I just wanted to get a sense of what this type of report is.

Could you tell me what this document is? I'm talking about the report that's attached to it.

A. I mean, I'm not sure of the generation

Page 91

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA of this report. This is a listing of trades that are currently in fail status. So I don't know whether this was -- what system it was taken out of, but it is, looking at the data itself, is it is fail information.

- Q. So am I correct to say that, during the course of this Thursday when you are trying to transfer all these securities, people would periodically get reports of what had failed and then they would try to clean them up?
- A. My group, along with the Clearance Group, was monitoring the status of failed trades or not in trying to, yes, effect those transfers and clean up the fails, yeah.
- O. And the 8 billion that you described earlier that didn't make it to BONY, those would all show up as fails that eventually could not be cleared up?

MR. SHAW: Just so we're clear, you mean on this list or --

MR. HINE: No, I'm not talking about

A. They would have initially been booked as transactions which would have showed as a

Page 92

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA fail status.

- Q. Okay.
- A. And then prior -- or, as a result of them not be being available, then, yes, they would have had to have been cleaned up.
- Q. Okay. Thanks. That's all I have for that document.

(Exhibit 138B, an e-mail chain, the first one in time bearing a date of September 18, 2008, at 5:40 P.M., marked for identification, as of this date.)

- Q. Ready to continue?
- A. Sure.
- Q. Mr. Hraska, I've handed you a copy of a document marked Exhibit 138B, which appears to be an e-mail chain dated September 18, 2008 in which you are a participant.

Could you just take a moment and just review this real quick and then I have a few questions.

(Document review.)

- Q. Have you had a chance to look at the document?
 - Yes, I have.

Page 93

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA

Q. Mr. Hraska, I was wondering if you can just explain to me generally what the issue is that's being discussed in this series of e-mails with respect to fails, if you recall.

MR. SHAW: Objection to form.

A. Yeah, I don't recall the issue being discussed. This -- it's a long time ago, but I believe this was forwarded to me just because I was involved in a transfer of collateral of some assets, and I think anybody that had any involvement with asset transfers for fails or anything, you know, were being kept apprized of all types transactions going on.

So, like I said earlier, I didn't really sort of know what was going on in some of these other negotiations. My role in this, not to dumb it down, was kind of like more to do with the mechanics of the financing, right? So kind of move assets from one place to another and talk to the trading desk. So I'm not a hundred percent sure as to what was going on here with this stuff.

Q. Okay. My question was were you involved in any discussions with Barclays about

8

9

. 0

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 94 1 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA 1 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA 2 Q. Do you recall any discussions or did 2 whether they were going to assume liabilities 3 you have any involvement in any efforts to amend 3 associated with fails? 4 that agreement --4 A. No, unfortunately not. 5 5 A. No. Q. Did you hear anything about that or recall hearing anything about that at the time? 6 Q. -- during that week? 6 7 7 Do you have any understanding of why A. I remember this mail. I don't 8 8 an amendment might have to be made to that remember any other -- like I wasn't 9 9 participating in any conversations about it or agreement during that week? 10 A. There was an amendment made to the 10 anything like that. agreement. There were amendments made. I'm not 11 11 Q. Okay. Before I forget, I wanted to 12 12 sure of the specifics of the amendments, but ask you, were you -- do you have any involvement 13 there were amendments because Barclays was 13 in -- during the week of September 15th, 2008, 14 did you have any involvement in any amendments 14 providing some financing to Lehman on a 15 to the Master Repurchase Agreement that were 1.5 tri-party basis, but ... 16 16 O. So was -being made? A. Not related to the transaction on the 17 A. Which one? There's -- let me -- let 117 18 me clarify my response. Master Repurchase 118 18th. There was -- Barclays was providing 19 financing prior to the 18th to Lehman as a 19 Agreement is usually between two counterparties, 20 the repo buyer and repo seller. So there 20 liquidity provider, no different than Fidelity 21 or Merrill Lynch. 21 were -- we have thousands, so I mean --22 22 Q. Okay. So did you have any role in O. Well, I see there's a Master 23 that financing? 23 Repurchase Agreement between Barclays and Lehman A. The role I would have had there is no 24 24 during that week, correct? 25 different than the role I would have had with 25 A. There is, that's correct. Page 96 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA 1 1 2 2 any other liquidity provider. Once the 3 3 agreement was signed and the, you know, the 4 4 appropriate schedules were put in place with JPMorgan Chase, then, you know, my team would 5 5 6 6

Page 97

Page 95

have been involved again in helping the desk find appropriate collateral that would have fit that schedule and things like that.

Q. Okay. So that is separate and distinct from the September 18th repo that we've been talking about, right?

A. That's correct.

7

8

9

0

1

12

.3

4

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Q. And what was that financing known as among you folks during that week?

A. It was just a tri-party repo transaction with Barclays. That was probably --I mean, that's best classified as a generic tri-party repo transaction. It was as true to form as they come. It was a transaction with a schedule, collateral. JPChase handled the allocations of the collateral.

O. The collateral used to support that financing was separate and distinct from the collateral used to support the September 18th repo, right?

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA

A. The collateral that was used to support that transaction was available collateral in the clearance boxes during the course of that week. Each day that transaction was an overnight transaction that went on and came off.

I wouldn't say that the collateral was separate and distinct. It was just collateral that was available in the boxes.

O. But the collateral could not support both -- same piece of collateral could not support both financings, right?

A. Well, that's correct, but at what point in time are we talking? This transaction, the transaction I'm discussing now was in place earlier on in the week prior to the 18th. So prior to the 18th, it -- any piece of collateral in the box would have been available.

Now, on the 18th, that transaction ceased to exist. So, you know, so there was no time -- there was no point in time when those transactions were both on at the same time.

O. Thank you. So why did that transaction cease to exist on the 18th?

L 3

Page 98

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA

MR. SHAW: Objection. Foundation.

1 2

.1

. 3

. 5

.7

. 8

bз

.3

L 5

A. I don't know. I mean, that's a trading decision as between I guess Barclays and Lehman's trading desk as to whether or not they were going to roll that transaction to the 18th.

Q. Did you ever hear any discussions about why that transaction was not rolled into the following day?

A. I don't know why it wasn't rolled. I know that it was not rolled, but I don't know why it wasn't rolled, no.

Q. Did the failure of it to roll affect in any way the September 18th repo that we've been talking about?

MR. SHAW: Objection. Foundation.

A. It did not affect the repo itself. The repo of September 18 had been completed on, you know, whatever that last transaction was, a deposit of cash, at 2, 3 o'clock in the morning point.

It was at that point that that was the main focus. Everybody at the firm was collateralizing that repo and, you know, Lehman believed at the time that that other transaction

Page 100

1490 10

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA that we were -- we were rolling the transaction for an additional day.

They suggested that we, you know, that we book a "held in custody" transaction, in which case, you know, JPChase would be looking to collect 15 billion that should have been, you know, delivered in if they were going to roll the transaction. JPChase would, you know, put a lien against the assets for the benefit of Barclays until the next morning.

Q. Are we talking Thursday night into Friday morning now?

A. Thursday night, yeah. This was done very late Thursday night or somewhere in the 2 to 3 o'clock hour of Friday morning, and the expectation was is that, you know -- or, Chase's expectation was is that we and/or them would contact Barclays and have them send in the payment with a back valuation adjustment for the 18th.

O. Did that ever happen?

A. No.

Q. Did you ever find out later why they didn't roll that loan?

Page 99

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA was also rolling and we were going to just finish that up after completing the other -- the large transaction, \$50 billion transaction.

But as it turns out, you know, at that late hour, we found out that Barclays hadn't in fact -- because in order to roll that transaction, they would have had to deposit 14 or 15 billion dollars in cash. So JPChase had informed us that, you know, as of that time, that cash had not yet come back in.

And at that point it was when we realized that, you know -- we didn't know what was Barclays' intention. We still assumed Barclays' intention was to roll it and that there was an operational problem or something with not sending those funds in. You know, we reached out and tried to contact some Barclays folks at the time, but we were unable to, so ...

Q. And how was this issue ever resolved? Do you know?

A. The issue on that evening, JPMorgan asked us what Barclays' intention was and, you know, we didn't know. We can only tell them what our intention was, and our intention was is

Page 101

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA

- A. Not specifically. Just found out that it was not their intent to roll that loan for that date.
 - Q. Have any general understanding of why?
 - A. No, not specifically. I mean ...
- Q. So am I correct to say that, because they didn't roll that loan, Lehman was forced to take this HIC loan from Chase?

A. Well, Chase forced Lehman into that position. What happened is, you know, Chase said, you know, we are, in essence, liening on those assets now until you come up with the 14 and change, 15 billion, I guess for round numbers, cash. And they basically seized the assets and put themselves on as the counterparty. Very similar to the -- it would have looked from a transactional perspective very similar to the box loan that was put on for the 7 billion.

Q. So, in the end, there is a HIC loan effected over that night, correct?

A. Over that night, there was a HIC loan that was booked with Barclays as a beneficiary. That beneficiary was changed by JPMorgan Chase

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 102

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA on the morning of the 19th, somewhere in before noon. I don't know exactly when it was.

Q. Changed to who?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

. 0

.1

.2

.3

. 4

. 5

. 6

.7

. 8

9

20 21

2.2

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

4

.5

. 6

.7

18

L 9

bο

21

22

23

24

A. Changed to Chase being the beneficiary.

Q. Can we discuss for a couple minutes the -- what happens to the September 18 repo after it's now been collateralized and the box loan has been granted? So there's a bunch of collateral supporting that loan. What happens on Friday with respect to that loan?

MR. SHAW: Foundation.

A. With respect to the overall loan, in other words, the whole repo transaction, or the loan to support the 7 billion in cash?

Q. The whole repo transaction.

A. The whole repo transaction, okay. So as a result of the fact that we deposited the 7 billion in cash, you know, normal course is for my group to work with tri-party operations to try to maximize the efficiency of our collateral.

So it's typical -- it's not typical to leave cash on deposit as collateral. I mean, Page 103

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA it's done on tri-party transactions in, you know, somewhat normal course, but, you know, ideally you try to substitute collateral.

So I had worked with the trading desk and the Tri-Party Ops folks and we started looking for collateral to substitute for that 7 billion. So that's I think we referenced a little bit earlier the billion-35 that we had come up with.

Q. Okay.

And again, the intent was to deliver the billion-35 in and to receive a portion of the cash -- equivalent market value of cash back.

Q. And what ended up happening? MR. SHAW: Objection. Foundation.

A. Yeah, I mean what ended up happening was we lived up to our part, we delivered the collateral in, and then there was some, you know, some dispute about the cash and, you know, some other things, and at the end of the day, you know, we never got returned the cash by Chase.

Q. Okay. On Friday of that week, LBI

Page 104

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA

files for bankruptcy, correct?

A. That's correct.

O. And do you recall any discussions about whether that would cause a default of the September 18 repo?

A. I think we talked about that a little bit. I mean, you know, I started thinking about it over the weekend, but I didn't have any real conversations about it until I got a call from the margin folks and until I sat down with Monty and we talked about whether that was going to trigger a default or not. Our assumption was that it was going to.

Q. At some point over that weekend, you work on transferring the collateral that was used to support the September 18 repo to Barclays, correct?

A. Not over the weekend, but --

Q. When --

A. The collateral was all transferred on the night of the 18th, and then there was that additional piece that we just talked about, which was transferred on the 19th.

Q. Right.

Page 105

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA

A. On the weekend we worked to try to locate additional collateral that would be eligible for a transfer.

O. And that's the 1.4 billion we talked about earlier?

A. That's the 1.4 billion, yeah.

Q. I had a question about that. Is that 1.4 billion as of that weekend; that's the value of that collateral over that weekend?

A. That was --

MR. SHAW: Objection. Foundation.

A. Again, that was -- the 1.4 billion is the assets that were actually transferred over a period of time, ending I believe on the 29th of September, and it was based off of values that were -- I actually don't know what the value, what they were based off of.

I think they were based off of some initial list, but they wouldn't have been based off of the date of transfer. Like nobody was --I wasn't involved in any repricing of assets or anything like that, so I believe they were based off of initial pricing.

You say you identified a pool of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

116

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 106

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA assets that were approximately worth 1.4 billion. Was that -- did Barclays end up getting all those assets?

A. Let me just --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

0

.1

L2

.3

4

5

6

7

. 8

9

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. SHAW: Mischaracterizes prior testimony.

Q. Go ahead, Mr. Hraska.

A. I identified the list that I think was probably greater than 1.4 billion. The 1.4 billion was only the securities that truly made the transfer over. So, you know, we identified the list of everything that we thought was unencumbered and available for transfer. What was physically able to be transferred equaled approximately the 1.4 billion.

Q. And what happened to the rest of the assets that you identified? Were they ever transferred to Barclays?

- A. They were hot.
- Q. Does Barclays thinks it's entitled to those assets?

MR. SHAW: Objection. Foundation.

- A. I honestly don't know.
- Since you've been working at Barclays,

Page 107

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA have you heard any discussions about whether they should be getting those assets?

A. I was instructed to continue to search for available collateral that was to be transferred to Barclays as part of the larger transaction between Barclays and Lehman, which I continue to do in my capacity in working with the Treasury folks and things like that, but I don't know specifically whether it was those same assets.

At that point in time, again, things had changed a little bit. You know, we stopped focusing on the repo because that had sort of been taking care of already and it was a matter of looking -- helping to continue to look for unencumbered assets.

- Q. So, just so I understand, you identified a list of unencumbered assets that was, to your mind, worth more than 1.4, but only 1.4 made it to Barclays; is that right?
 - A. That's correct, yes.
- Q. Do you know how much more than 1.4 the assets were that you identified?

MR. SHAW: Objection. Asked and

Page 108

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA answered.

A. I -- I know that it was probably in the neighborhood of around 2 billion, but I don't know how much more than that.

O. Okav.

A. We had a lot of discussions about the assets that, you know, and I can't recall whether it was what is -- what ended up being the list was assets that are only in the DTC boxes or, you know, we were looking across international boxes and all that stuff. So there was just so much going and I know it was north 1.4. I want to say it was 2 billion, but I can't be sure.

Q. Were you involved, since you've been at Barclays, have you been involved in any efforts to prepare an opening balance sheet that would relate to the Lehman/Barclays transaction?

A. No.

Q. Did you have any role in connection with their declaration -- or, let me withdraw that. Do you have any knowledge of or understanding of how Barclays was able to declare a \$4.2 billion gain on acquisition as a Page 109

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA

result of this transaction?

A. No.

Q. Do you have any current role in the preparation of Barclays' balance sheets?

A. No, the typically balance sheet and things like that are performed by the Finance folks and Product Control folks, which is completely aware from Operations.

Q. Do you give them any input during the course of their preparation of the balance sheets?

A. If they have questions as to the nature of transaction -- are we talking related to the transaction between LBI and --

O. Yes.

A. Okay. I have provided information as to that transaction on the 18th and what assets were transferred over, and I provided some information around 1.4 billion as to what those assets were that made it to Barclays, but as far as determination of balance sheet or if those assets were eligible for balance sheet, I don't have any knowledge of that.

Q. Okay. When you say -- who did you

Page 110

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA provide that information to? The Treasury Department?

A. That would have been, yeah, Paolo and his team.

.0

<u> 1</u>

L 6

Q. How did you come to be involved in what we have called Schedule A and Schedule B?

A. Well, I guess I provided the assets that ultimately became -- I provided lists of assets that ultimately became Schedule A and Schedule B. I was asked to provide schedules of the assets that made it to Bank of New York, which we did, and then as well as, you know -- you know, and over a period of dates, right?

So, to be very simple, I basically provided a spreadsheet with tabs that said on this date we moved these assets, on this date we moved these assets, and those subsequently became categorized as either Schedule A or Schedule B, depending on I guess the timing of the transfer.

Q. Do you have any knowledge of what has been called a clarification letter in connection with this transaction?

A. I've had -- I've heard the term, but

10 Page 111

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA honestly I don't know what it means.

Q. Have you ever read anything called a clarification letter?

A. No.

Q. You have to say verbally say no?

A. I'm sorry. No.

Q. Did you have any understanding when you were preparing these schedules that that would become Schedules A and B to a clarification letter?

A. No.

Q. Did you have any understanding of the purpose of this clarification letter?

A. No.

Q. I want to spend a little time going through these schedules. Do you want to take a break before we do that?

MR. SHAW: Why don't we take a short break before we do that.

THE WITNESS: Thank you. (Recess; Time Noted: 11:33 A.M.) (Time Noted: 11:40 A.M.)

BY MR. HINE:

Q. Mr. Hraska, I now want to talk about

Page 112

Page 113

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA

Schedules A and B, so this is going to be the 30(b)(6) portion of your deposition because that's the two topics that you have been designated in part to cover.

So what I'd like to do is walk through some of the different schedules that I have seen and discuss them in connection with Schedules A and B.

A. Okay.

(Exhibit 139B, Printout of Schedules, marked for identification, as of this date.)

Q. Mr. Hraska, I'm handing you a document which I've marked as Exhibit 139B.

A. Okay.

Q. Which is a voluminous printout of schedules of some sort. It is marked with the Bates stamps BCI-EX-00009798 through 10368.

MR. SHAW: I'm not suggesting you read this cover to cover, but take whatever time you need to review.

Q. I'm not going to ask you questions about detailed entries in here, but I'm going to ask you questions primarily about the first two pages, but take whatever time you need just to

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA familiarize yourself with the document.

A. Thank you.

(Document review.)

A. Okay.

Q. Have you had a chance to review it briefly?

A. I have, yes.

Q. Have you ever seen this document before?

A. Yes, I have. I created it.

Q. And is this a -- or, well, let's start this way. What is this document?

A. This is an e-mail to John Rodefeld, who was Barclays, as we mentioned, Operations, and Kevin Caffrey, who is the managing director at Bank of New York in charge of like clearing, custody, tri-party, things like that.

And what I was looking to do here was to confirm what Lehman believed that, you know, they transferred as a result of the repo transaction on the 18th. We wanted to reconcile -- we wanted to do a three-way reconciliation. Basically, we wanted Lehman's books to tie out with both Barclays and with

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 114

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA Bank of New York so that we could confirm the secured identifiers, the par amounts, and things like that of the transaction.

And so the spreadsheet itself attached was my department's collaboration of what we believed we transferred on the 18th, and then the last point here is me reaching out to Kevin to talk about, you know, clearance relationships going forward for the broker-dealer, LBI.

Q. That's point number 4 on the e-mail you're talking about?

A. That's point number 4 on the e-mail, yes.

Q. Can you turn to the second page of this document?

MR. SHAW: That's the one with the Bates number ending in 9799?

MR. HINE: Correct.

Q. That's a very small chart with columns A and B, do you see that?

A. Uh-huh.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

. 0

.1

2

L3

14

.5

6

17

18

L 9

20

21

2

23

24

2.5

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

LO

11

L2

L3

L 4

L 5

.8

9

20

21

22

23

24

Q. Now, I think I understand what this is, but could you explain to me what you understand this chart to be capturing?

Page 116

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA securities that were transferred were this entire list other than TP cash.

Q. Okay.

A. Because these other two are included in the Fed program. So this was Fed program securities that were Fed wire eligible. That's what that first line is.

Q. What does "Fed wire eligible" mean?

A. Well, Fed wire eligible is a type of security that's transferred on the Federal Reserve's book entry transfer system. So examples are U.S. Treasuries, Fannie Maes, Ginne Maes, collateral types of those classes.

Other types of collateral are typically transferred through DTC, which is represented by the participant IDs here, DTC participant IDs.

Q. Just to harken back to our prior discussion, this reflects the approximately 42 billion in securities plus the 7 billion in cash that was ultimately transferred under the September 18th repo, correct?

A. That's correct.

Q. Now, how were these market values

Page 115

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA

A. This chart was my group's attempt to summarize the market value on the collateral in these appropriate buckets just to give people an understanding of the composition of the collateral and market value that we associated with that.

So the Fed collateral would be -- the Fed wirable type collateral, as I defined earlier, and then 74 and 636 would have been the positions that came out of the Depository Trust Company.

And then what's referred to as TP cash is the 7 billion pure cash that we talked about as well.

Q. Okay. The TP cash is the proceeds from the box loan that we talked when earlier?

A. Yes, that's correct.

Q. And when you say "Fed wirable," that is the -- that is securities that were successfully transferred from the Fed program to BONY on Thursday; is that right?

A. No, let me clarify that. Those are the securities that were transferred that were Fed wirable security types because the

Page 117

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA determined?

A. I don't know how they were determined. They were provided from what Lehman had in their systems at the time.

O. So these are Lehman's values?

A. I know those to be Lehman's values.

Q. And I think we might have touched on this before, but Bank of New York ascribed its own values to those securities?

A. They did, yes.

Q. So am I correct to say that this chart and spreadsheet would not include Bank of New York valuations, but only included the Lehman valuations?

A. That would be correct, yes.

Q. Okay. Now, did you get -- your covering e-mail asks I presume Mr. Rodefeld and Mr. Caffrey to verify the positions. Did they in fact try to do that?

A. Yes, we did that. They sent us back files and we reconciled all the positions.

Q. Okay. Let me show you another chart. I think it'll relate to the story, but I'm not sure.

Page 118

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA

Mr. Hraska, I hand you an exhibit that's previously been marked as Exhibit 83B, which is an e-mail dated Sunday, September 21st.

MR. SHAW: Do you have a copy which is not cut off on the side?

MR. HINE: We'll try to locate one.

MR. SHAW: He needs one that's complete rather than ...

(Document handed.)

A. Okay.

. 6

. 0

.3

- 6

L 9

4

Q. Mr. Hraska, have you had a chance to look at the document?

A. I have.

Q. Have you ever seen this document before?

A. No.

Q. To your knowledge, are the people listed in the "to" and "from" portions of the e-mail Barclays employees, generally?

A. Primarily, yes.

Q. You'll see in the first — the first bullet point in the text that says, "We should book all positions from the Lehman financing facility to BCI (approximately 45 billion) Page 119

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA securities. See attached files." Do you see that?

A. I do see that, yes.

- Q. When you had this effort to reconcile your position with Barclays and BONY, did you ever hear the figure of approximately 45 billion used as the value for the securities that were in the September 18 repo?
 - A. No, not specifically 45 billion.

Q. Do you have any knowledge of where this figure might have come from?

A. Unfortunately, no. I don't think I'm CC'd on here. I didn't see myself and I don't recognize it.

Q. No, you're not CC'd. I'm just wondering, in your discussions between at or about, you know, Saturday, Sunday that weekend, if you heard any use of a number of about 45 billion in connection with the securities that were listed in your prior exhibit?

MR. SHAW: Objection. Asked and answered.

A. I hadn't heard any discussions related to 45 billion securities. People mistakenly,

Page 120

Page 121

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA

like we were talking terms earlier, referred to the \$45 billion in cash. So it's possible that somebody was referring to the cash and not securities here, but I'm speculating on that. I don't really know.

Q. Can you describe for me the reconciliation process that took place with respect to these securities? Was there a debate as to the value assigned to the securities?

MR. SHAW: Objection to form.

A. There was --

MR. SHAW: And foundation.

A. There was -- from an operations perspective, our primary objective was to make sure that the quantities and the Cusips all matched. You know, as we talked about the market values that we knew were based off of Lehman's systems, there was some discussion about the value of the securities.

I wasn't privy to the actual discussions. I knew there was going to be a value -- a discussion about value of securities because Bank of New York informed me that they didn't agree with some of the pricing that we

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA had attached to some of these securities.

Q. And what did they tell you about that?

A. Very generically, they basically said that we're going to have to review these prices, we don't necessarily agree with these, and at that point it kind of went out of my camp, because, again, I don't really deal with the pricing side of it. I just have to make sure the securities make it, the right quantities make it, there's no stock record breaks and all that kind of stuff.

Q. Who deals with the pricing part of it?

- A. The pricing part at both Barclays and at Lehman would be handled by the Financial Control folks. So I would say like, you know, in the current organization, I guess Marty Klein and those folks, and at Lehman it would have been Gerry Reilly's organization.
- Q. Okay. Is there any, in this reconciliation effort that you talked about, is there a reconciliation as to price or is it just the identifying Cusips and the particular securities that were transferred?
 - A. My reconciliation was purely to

1 2

Page 122

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA securities quantities, that kind of thing. And like I said, I know that the finance teams were going back and forth on the pricing issue, but, unfortunately, I didn't really partake in those discussions.

- Q. Do you know how -- what price they arrived at at the end?
 - A. I don't, unfortunately.

Q. It appears in some documents that the BONY pricing was higher than the prices ascribed to the securities on your -- on the prior exhibit. Do you have any idea why that would be the case?

MR. SHAW: Objection to form.

- A. I don't. It's actually very surprising to me as well, because the initial conversation that I just referenced a few minutes ago was from Bank of New York that we had over-valued a few securities and, therefore, they were concerned about the total market value that we had sent them. So, you know...
- Q. Do you recall any discussions about writing down the value of securities during this period?

Page 123

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA

MR. SHAW: Objection to form.

- A. During -- could I ask a clarification?

 During which period? During the period at any point in time after the transaction, or during like a period of the week, or what point in time?
- Q. Let's break it down. Let's talk about this -- during this reconciliation period that you mentioned, which I take it is from Friday, the 19th, through the weekend, correct?
 - A. Okay.
- Q. So were there any discussions during that period about writing down the value of securities?

MR. SHAW: Just so we're clear, because this is a 30(b)(6), are there discussions that he participated in?
MR. HINE: That he's aware of.

- A. I'm aware there were discussions about the values of the securities. As to writing up or down, I wasn't made privy to that.
- Q. At any time during this week were you privy to any discussions where the possibility of writing down the value of securities was

Page 124

Page 125

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA discussed?

- A. No.
- Q. So, back to Exhibit 83B, based on your experience, is it fair to assume that this is probably a document generated by Barclays in connection with that reconciliation effort that you were discussing?
 - A. I would assume that's the case, yes.
- Q. Okay. But you have no specific knowledge about how this document was prepared or --
 - A. I don't, unfortunately, no.
- Q. Mr. Hraska, I'm handing you a copy of a document marked as Exhibit 84B. If you wouldn't mind taking a moment to review it. Just for the record, the document is Bates-stamped BCI-008149 through 8670.

(Document review.)

- A. Presentation of these is definitely not user-friendly.
- Q. Forced to print them out for purposes of a deposition.
 - A. I understand that.
 (Document review.)

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA

A. Okay.

- Q. Have you had a chance to look at the document?
 - A. I have.
- Q. Have you ever seen this document before?
- A. No. Well, actually, I have seen this in the preparation to my -- this portion of the deposition.
 - Q. Okay.
- A. I actually reviewed some files, and I believe this is one of the ones on that list. I'm not a hundred percent sure, but I think it is
- Q. Okay. Other than your preparation for this deposition, do you recall seeing this document at all?
 - A. No.
- Q. I noticed they misspelled your name on the front. Is that a possible reason why you might have not received this document?
- A. Yeah, because it wouldn't have gone to my e-mail, if that's the case.
 - Q. Would it be fair to say you have no

Page 126 Page 127 1 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA 1 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA 2 familiarity with how this document was prepared? 2 all or does this remind you of anything in 3 3 A. That's true. connection with how Bank of New York valued this 4 4 Q. Okay. And the covering e-mail says -pool of securities? 5 MR. SHAW: Objection to form. 5 it's an e-mail from Mr. Yang, which says, "I've 6 A. Unfortunately, not. I mean, I -- the 6 attached a schedule produced by Barclays' Ops of 7 7 the collateral currently held at BONY under the only 45 billion that I was aware of was the 8 actual principal value, and I don't remember 8 repo financing provided to Lehman." It 9 assets being referred to as 45 billion in any of 9 continues to say that -- it says "a total BONY 10 the conversations that I had. 0. market value of approximately 45 billion." You 11 Q. Okay. And when you say the principal L1 see that? 12 value, you're talking about the amount of --12 A. I do, yes. 13 .3 A. Cash extended on the transaction. Q. Is it probably safe to assume that this was prepared in connection with your 14 Q. Okay. So is it correct to say that in 14 reconciliation effort between Lehman and Bank of 15 this reconciliation process that you discussed .5 6 New York and Barclays as to the securities that 16 you don't recall anyone ever mentioning a value 17 were involved in the September 18 repo? 17 of this pool of securities being about \$45 18 18 MR. SHAW: Objection. Foundation. billion? 19 19 MR. SHAW: Asked and answered. Calls for speculation. 20 20 Yeah, I guess it's fair to assume A. That's correct. 21 Q. So, just to complete the record, you b 1. then. 22 Q. Again, do you see the number of 45 22 have no way of explaining how this value in this 23 document would differ with the \$42.9 billion 23 billion? 24 number in Exhibit -- in the prior exhibit that 24 A. Uh-huh. 25 Does this refresh your recollection at 25 you looked at; is that right? Page 129 Page 128 1 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA 1 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA valuing it at 42, the average price on a basket 2 2 MR. SHAW: Prior exhibit, are you 3 3 basis would mean that they valued the basket referring to 139B? 4 higher. I'm sure there were multiple assets 4 Q. 139B. Let me rephrase the question. 5 5 A. Okay. where there were pricing differentials, but as 6 Q. In Exhibit 139B --6 an aggregate, it appears that they gave higher 7 7 A. Right, that's my document. values to most securities. 8 Q. - which is the document you prepared, 8 Q. Let me ask you this. In this reconciliation - well, scratch that. The 9 9 has a value of 42.9 billion, approximately? 0 0 difference could arise, could it not, either A. Right. Q. This one seems to ascribe a value of 11 from how you value individual securities or _1 45 billion. .2 whether you have the same pool of securities 2 .3 13 that you're looking at, correct? A. Okay. 14 Q. Do you have any way to -- any 14 That's correct. I thought the -- yes, A. 15 15 explanation for why they would come to different okay. 16 Q. Well, my question is, in this 16 values? 17 17 MR. SHAW: Objection. Calls for reconciliation process, did it end up that there was a vast difference in the pool of securities 18 18 speculation. 19 that were being considered? 19 A. My opinion is that the Lehman pricing 20 That's a different question. 20 was different than the Bank of New York pricing. A. 21 Between the Barclays folks and your Q. In what way? 21 Q. 22 22 A. Well, in the tune of \$3 billion. I list? 23 A. From a security delivery perspective, mean -- I mean, I'm not trying to be sarcastic. 23

24

25

I mean, you know, to the extent that they're

valuing a pool of collateral at 45 and we're

24

we tied out completely to the number of

securities and the security identifiers that we

Fage 130 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL -J. HRASKA delivered versus what Bank of New York and Barclays knew. Q. When you say "tied out"? A. "Tied out," meaning we reconciled that there were no discrepancies. Q. So the difference in any values would have to be in the method of pricing, then, correct? A. Yes, the cone thing, we tied out the ticout process took a few days, so I don't know whether on September 22 we were completely tied out, but the initial tieout itself, though, there were minimal, minimal discrepancies. I would say, you know, probably less than a hundred. Q. So would you agree with me, then, that if there is a difference in pricing, it would probably be the result of how you price individual securities instead of Q the composition of the pool? MR. ShAW. Objection to form. A. And not so much. Q the composition of the pool? MR. ShAW. Objection to form. A. Uh-luh. Q the composition of the pool? A. Uh-luh. Page 133 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL -J. HRASKA A. So then could you repeat the question? (Exabibit 140B, a document bearing (Exable 140B, a document bearing (Exabibit 140B, a document bearing (Exabibit 140B, a document bearing With Bates Nos. BCI-C-Go0062538 through 53173, and reform that there are many the recombilisation of the covering entire the pricing, it would you creat the ar	г		1	
delivered versus what Bank of New York and Barclays knew. Q. When you say "tied out"? A. "Tied out," meaning we reconciled that there were no discrepancies. Q. So the difference in any values would have to be in the method of pricing, then, correct? A. Yes, the one thing, we tied out — the tieout process took a few days, so I don't know whether on September 22 we were completely tied there were minimal, minimal discrepancies. I would say, you know, probably less than a hundred. Q. So would you agree with me, then, that if there is a difference in pricing, it would probably be the result of how you price individual securities instead of —		Page 130	***************************************	Page 131
Barchays knew. Q. When you say "tied out"? A. "Tied out," meaning we reconciled that there were no discrepancies. Q. When you say "tied out"? A. Yes. Q. Os the difference in any values would have to be in the method of pricing, then, ocrrect? A. Yes, the one thing, we tied out — the tieout process took a few days, so I don't know whether on September 22 we were completely tied out, but the initial tieout itself, though, there were minimal, minimal discrepancies. I would say, you know, probably less than a hundred. Q. So would you agree with me, then, that if there is a difference in pricing, it would probably be the result of how you price individual securities instead of — Q. — the composition of the pool? M. SILAW: Objection to form. A. Ves. Q. A. Okay. Q. A. Uh-hub. Page 132 I HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA Q. Vou'll see the — first of all, have you exerseen this document before? A. In preparation for the deposition, yes, but other than fliat, no. Q. Okay, You'll see on the covering e-mail it mentions Schedule A, you see that? A. Okay. Q. It says here, "Our guys are still running the reconcilation to confirm that there are no errors in the Barclays list." Do you see that? A. Uh-hub. Q. And then if you turn to the last tab in the document, it's a lengthy schedule which concludes with a number, a figure on the last page — Q. — of 44, of approximately \$44.1 billion, do you see that? A. Ido, yes. A. Ido, yes. A. Ido, yes. A. Ido, yes. A. Ves. Q. Okay. Q. Okay. Do you read the faction of the pool? A. Uh-hub. Q. And then fity ou turn to the last tab in the document, it's a lengthy schedule which concludes with a number, a figure on the last page — Q. — of 44, of approximately \$44.1 billion over being used in connection with the value of the securities on Schedule A? A. Ido, yes. A. Ido, yes. A. Ido, yes. A. No.	1	HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA	1	HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA
3 Barclays knew. 3 3 (Record read.)	2	delivered versus what Bank of New York and	2	A. So then could you repeat the question?
4 MR. SHAW: Objection to form. A. "Tied out," meaning we reconciled that there were no discrepancies. Q. So the difference in any values would have to be in the method of pricing, then, correct? A. Yes, the one thing, we tied out — the ticout process took a few days, so I don't know whether on September 22 we were completely tied out, but the initial ticout isself, though 14 there were minimal, minimal discrepancies. I there were minimal, minimal discrepancies. I would say, you know, probably less than a hundred. Q. So would you agree with me, then, that if there is a difference in pricing, it would probably be the result of how you price individual securities instead of — A. And not so much— Q. — the composition of the pool? MR. SHAW: Objection to form. A. Yes. Q. Okay. (Exhibit 140B, a document bearing Barsons. BCI-CG00952538 through 53173, marked for identification, as of this date.) Q. Mr. Hraska, I'm handing you a document that's been marked as Exhibit 140B. A. Okay. Q. Say owould say, you know, probably less than a hundred. I hundred. Q. So would you agree with me, then, that if there is a difference in pricing, it would probably be the result of how you price individual securities instead of — A. And not so much— Q. — the composition of the pool? MR. SHAW: Objection to form. Q. A. Yes. Barsons. BCI-CG00952538 through 53173, marked for identification, as of this date.) Q. Mand probably be the result of how you price individual securities in pricing, it would you agree with me, then, that if there is a difference in pricing, it would you agree with me, then, that if there is a difference in pricing, it would you agree with me, then, that if there is a difference in pricing, it would you agree with me, then, that if there is a difference in pricing, it would you agree with me, then, that if there is a difference in pricing, it would you agree with me, then, that if there is a difference in pricing, it would you agree with me, then, that if there is a difference with you and you have the	3	Barclays knew.	3	
5 A. "Tied out," meaning we reconciled that 6 there were no discrepancies. I 7 Q. So the difference in any values would 8 have to be in the method of pricing, then, 9 correct? 10 A. Yes, the one thing, we tied out — the 11 tieout process took a few days, so I don't know whether on September 22 we were completely ried 13 out, but the initial tieout itself, though, 14 there were minimal, minimal discrepancies. I 15 would say, you know, probably less than a 16 hundred. 17 Q. So would you agree with me, then, that 18 if there is a difference in pricing, it would 19 probably be the result of how you price 19 individual securities instead of — 20 Q. Hand the result of how you price 21 A. And not so much — 22 Q. — the composition of the pool? 23 MR. SHAW: Objection to form. You 24 need to let him finish his question and then 25 lillGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA 2 Q. You'll see the — first of all, have 2 you ever seen this document before? 2 A. Ih huh, 3 Q. And at the bottom of the covering 4 A. Uh-huh, 4 Q. And the bottom of the covering 5 cernal it mentions Schedule A, you see that? 5 A. Uh-huh, 6 Q. And the bottom of the covering 6 cernal it mentions Schedule A, you see that? 6 A. Uh-huh, 7 Q. And the bottom of the covering 8 A. Uh-huh, 9 Q. And the bottom of the covering 9 cernal it mentions Schedule A, you see that? 1 A. The last page? 1 A. The last page? 2 Q. — of 44, of approximately \$44.1\$ billion, do you see that? 2 A. Ido, yes. 1 A. No. 2 Cookay. You'll see on the cover page 15 that? 2 A. Chay. 3 And gain, it's a voluminous schedule 16 the worder of him would provide that the figure on the last page. 1 A. Okay. 2 MR. SHAW: Objection to form. You need to let him finish his question and then the object so we have a clean record. 2 A. Okay. 3 And again, it's a voluminous schedule, but take your time to review it. 4 A. Okay. 4 A. Okay. 5 A. Okay. 6 Q. Wh. Hraska, have you had a chance to look at it briefly? 2 A. No is the short answer. We talked earlier about pricing differentials. So, to me, it of the court of	4		4	
6 there were no discrepancies. Q. Okay. Q. Okay. Q. Okay. (Exhibit 140B, a document bearing Bates Nos. BCI-CG00052538 through 53173, marked for identification, so fits date.) Q. Mr. Hraska, I'm handing you a document that's been marked as Exhibit 140B. A. Okay. Q. So would you agree with me, then, that if there were minimal, minimal discrepancies. I Mould say, you know, probably less than a hundred. Q. So would you agree with me, then, that if there is a difference in pricing, it would probably be the result of how you price individual securities instead of A. And not so much Q the composition of the pool? MR. SHAW: Objection to form. Page 132 MR. SHAW: Objection to form. Page 134 MIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA Q. You'll see the first of all, have you ever seen this document before? A. Uh-huh, Q. And at the bottom of the deposition, yes, but other than that, no. Q. Okay. You'll see on the cover page e-mall it mentions Schedule A, you see that? A. Okay. Q. It says here, "Our guys are still running the reconcillation to confirm that there are no errors in the Barclays list." Do you see that? A. The last page? Q of 44, of approximately \$44.1 billion, do you see that? A. Ido, yes. A. Ido, yes.	5		5	-
7 Q. So the difference in any values would 8 have to be in the method of pricing, then, 9 correct? 10 A. Yes, the one thing, we tied out—the 11 tieout process took a few days, so I don't know 12 whether on September 22 we were completely tied 13 out, but the initial tieout isself, though, 14 there were minimal, minimal discrepancies. I 15 would say, you know, probably less than a 16 hundred. 17 Q. So would you agree with me, then, that 18 if there is a difference in pricing, it would 19 probably be the result of how you price 10 individual securities instead of— 20 Q. — the composition of the pool? 21 A. And not so much— 22 Q. — the composition of the pool? 23 MR. SHAW: Objection to form. You 24 need to let him finish his question and then 25 let me object so we have a clean record. 26 Q. You'll see the — first of all, have 27 you ever seen this document before? 28 A. Uh-huh. 29 Q. And at the bottom of the covering 29 cerval in mentions Schedule A, you see that? 20 A. Okay. 21 Q. And the bottom of the covering 22 q. It says here, "Our guys are still 23 running the reconcillation to confirm that there are no errors in the Barclays list." Do you see that? 30 A. The last page? 31 Q. — of 44, of approximately \$44.1 billion, do you see that? 4 A. I do, yes. 4 A. I do, yes. 4 A. I do, yes. 5 Okay. So wo recall the figure \$44.1 billion, do you see that? 5 A. I do, yes. 5 Okay. So we have a clean record. 6 Q. Okay, You'll see on the covering email it mentions Schedule A, you see that? 6 A. Uh-hub. 7 Q. And the bottom of the covering email it mentions Schedule A; you see that? 6 A. Uh-hub. 7 Q. And the bottom of the covering email it mentions Schedule A; you see that? 6 A. Uh-hub. 7 Q. And the initial ticout isself, though, we have a clean record. 7 A. Okay. 8 A. Uh-hub. 9 Q. And the bottom of the covering email it mentions Schedule A; you we have a clean record. 8 A. Uh-hub. 9 Q. And the bottom of the covering email it mentions Schedule A; you we have a clean record. 9 Q. Bight. 9 A. Uh-hub. 16 Q. Okay. Ov you guy reca	1		6	
Bates Nos. BCI-CG-00052538 through 53173, marked for identification, as of this date. A. Yes, the one thing, we tied out — the tieout process took a few days, so I don't know whether on September 22 we were completely tied out, but the initial tieout itself; though, there were minimal, minimal discrepancies. I twould say, you know, probably less than a hundred. Q. So would you agree with me, then, that if there is a difference in pricing, it would probably be the result of how you price individual securities instead of — 20 A. And not so much — 21 (Document review). A. And not so much — 22 MR. SHAW: Objection to form. You need to let him finish his question and then let me object so we have a clean record. Page 132 MIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA 2 Q. You'll see the — first of all, have you ever seen this document before? A. Uh-huh. Q. Okay. You'll see on the cover page that this is dared Friday, September 26? A. Uh-huh. Q. And at the bottom of the covering e-mail it mentions Schedule A, you see that? A. Okay. Q. It says here, "Our guys are still running the reconciliation to confirm that there are no errors in the Barclays list." Do you see that? A. Okay. Q. Right. A. Well, this is an e-mail I wasn't included on. Q. And the fity ou turn to the last tab in the document, it's a lengthy schedule which concludes with a number, a figure on the last tab in the document, it's a lengthy schedule which concludes with a number, a figure on the last tab billion, do you see that? A. The last page? Q. — of 44, of approximately \$44.1 billion ever being used in connection with the value of the securities on Schedule A? A. No. Okay. Bace Nos. BCI-CG-00052538 through 51173, marked for identification, so of this day, our that's been marked as Exhibit 140B. A. Okay. Q. A. Whe Hraska, I'm handing speak found that's been marked as Exhibit 140B. A. Okay. Q. Hars really going to ask you about the, primarily, the first and last page. A. Okay. Q. Mr. Hraska, have you had a chance to look at it briefly? A. I have,	1	•	7	- •
marked for identification, as of this date.) A. Yes, the one thing, we tied out — the tieout process took a few days, so I don't know whether on September 22 we were completely tied out, but the initial tieout itself, though, there were minimal, minimal discrepancies. I would say, you know, probably less than a hundred. Your So would you agree with me, then, that if there is a difference in pricing, it would probably be the result of how you price individual securities instead of— A. And not so much— Whether on September 22 we were completely tied to hundred. Would say, you know, probably less than a hundred. May out agree with me, then, that if there is a difference in pricing, it would probably be the result of how you price individual securities instead of— MR. SHAW: Objection to form. You need to let him finish his question and then let me object so we have a clean record. Page 132 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA Q. You'll see the — first of all, have you ever seen this document hefore? A. In preparation for the deposition, yes, but other than that, no. Q. Okay. You'll see on the cover page that this is dated Friday, September 26? A. Ub-huh. Q. And at the bottom of the covering e-mail it mentions Schedule A, you see that? A. Okay. Q. Okay. You'll see on the cover page that this is dated Friday, September 26? A. Ub-huh. Q. And at the bottom of the covering e-mail it mentions Schedule A, you see that? A. Okay. Q. Okay. You'll see on the cover page that this is dated Friday, September 26? A. Ub-huh. Q. And at the bottom of the covering e-mail it mentions Schedule A, you see that? A. Okay. Q. Okay. You'll see on the cover page that this is dated Friday, September 26? A. Ub-huh. Q. And at the bottom of the covering e-mail it mentions Schedule A, you see that? A. Okay. Q. Okay. You'll see on the cover page that this is dated Friday, September 26? A. Ub-huh. Q. And at the bottom of the covering e-mail it mentions Schedule A, you see that? A. Okay. Q. Okay. You'll see on the cover page tha	8	- ·	8	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
A. Yes, the one thing, we tied out — the licout process look a few days, so I don't know whether on September 22 we were completely tied out, but the initial tieout itself, though, there were minimal, minimal discrepancies. I would say, you know, probably less than a hundred. 7 Q. So would you agree with mc, then, that if there is a difference in pricing, it would probably be the result of how you price individual securities instead of — 20 individual securities instead of — 21 A. And not so much — 21 (Document review.) 8 A. Al hand to so much — 22 we have a clean record. 9 A. And not so much — 24 whether this is dated Friday, September 26? 4 A. In preparation for the deposition, yes, but other than that, no. 9 Q. Okay. You'll see on the cover page that this is dated Friday, September 26? A. Uh-huh. 9 Q. And at the bottom of the covering e-mail it mentions Schedule A, you see that? A. Uh-huh. Q. And then if you turn to the last tab in the document, it's a lengthy schedule which concludes with a number, a figure on the last tap in the document, it's a lengthy schedule which concludes with a number, a figure on the last tap billion, do you see that? A. The last page? Q. — of 44, of approximately \$44.1 billion ac you recall the figure \$44.1 billion are will billion, do you see that? A. The last page? Q. — of 44, of approximately \$44.1 billion ac you recall the figure \$44.1 billion are value of this schedule A? A. No. So it doesn't look like the format of any of the files that I produced, so that's why I'm assuming — well, me being Lehman at the time, Lehman-produced. Q. Okay. Do you recall the figure \$44.1 billion are value of the securities on Schedule A? A. The last page? Q. — of 44, of approximately \$44.1 billion are value of this schedule on. Q. Okay. Oyou'll see on the covering the first of all, have you see that? A. Okay. Q. Nath this is an e-mail I wasn't included on. Q. Right. A. Okay. Q. Right. A. Well, this is an e-mail I wasn't included on. Q. Okay. Do you recall the figure \$44.		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	9	
ticout process took a few days, so I don't know whether on September 22 we were completely tied of out, but the initial ticout itself, though, there were minimal, minimal discrepancies. I bundred. Would say, you know, probably less than a bundred. Q. So would you agree with me, then, that if there is a difference in pricing, it would probably be the result of how you price individual securities instead of A. And not so much A. And not so much MR. SHAW: Objection to form. You need to let him finish his question and then let me object so we have a clean record. Page 132 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA Q. You'll see thefirst of all, have you exeen this document before? A. In preparation for the deposition, yes, but other than that, no. Q. Okay, You'll see on the cover page that this is dated Friday, September 26? A. Uh-huh. Q. And at the bottom of the covering e-mail it mentions Schedule A, you see that? A. Okay. HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA 2 on the cover page that this is dated Friday, September 26? A. Okay. A. No is the short answer. We talked earlier about pricing differentials. So, to me, I don't know whether this is a Lehman-produced or me to be a Lehman-produced, so Q. Mra stable bottom of the covering e-mail it mentions Schedule A, you see that? A. Okay. A. No is the short answer. We talked earlier about pricing differentials. So, to me, I don't know whether this is a Lehman-produced or me to be a Lehman-produced it. It doesn't appear to be a Lehman-produced document, are you referring to the last tab in the document, it's a lengthy schedule which concludes with a number, a figure on the last tab in the document, it's a lengthy schedule which concludes with a number, a figure on the last tab in the document, it's a lengthy schedule which concludes with a number, a figure on the last tab in the document, it's a lengthy schedule which concludes with a number, a figure on the last tab in the document, it's a lengthy schedule which concludes with a number, a figure on the l	1		10	
whether on September 22 we were completely tied out, but the initial tieout isself, though, there were minimal, minimal discrepancies. I would say, you know, probably less than a holded. Q. So would you agree with me, then, that if there is a difference in pricing, it would probably be the result of how you price individual securities instead of— Q. — the composition of the pool? MR. SHAW: Objection to form. You need to let him finish his question and then let me object so we have a clean record. Page 132 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA Q. You'll see the — first of all, have you ever seen this document before? A. In preparation for the deposition, yes, but other than that, no. Q. Okay. You'll see on the cover page that this is dated Friday, September 26? A. Uh-huh. Q. And at the bottom of the covering e-mail it mentions Schedule A, you see that? A. Okay. Q. It says here, "Our guys are still running the reconciliation to confirm that there are no errors in the Barclays list." Do you see that? A. Uh-huh. Q. And then if you turn to the last tab in the document, it's a lengthy schedule which concludes with a number, a figure on the last tab in the document, it's a lengthy schedule which concludes with a number, a figure on the last tab billion, do you see that? A. The last page? A. I do, yes. A. I do, yes. A. Okay. A. Okay. A. Okay. A. Okay. A. Okay. A. Okay. A. Okay. A. Okay. A. Okay. Bage 132 A. Okay. A. Okay. A. Okay. A. No is the short answer. We talked of the securities embodied in the schedule is now at this point in time at \$44.1 billion as opposed to the 42.9 that we saw earlier? A. No is the short answer. We talked of the securities on the time, included on. A. Well, this is an e-mail I wasn't included on. Q. Right. A. Well, this is an e-mail I wasn't included on. Q. Right. A. Okay. A. No. Okay. A. When you say it doesn't appear to be a Lehman-produced, so that's why I'm assuming — well, me being Lehman at the time, primarily, the first and last page. A. Okay. A. Okay. A. Okay. A. Okay. A. No	1	-	11	
out, but the initial ticout itself, though, there were minimal, minimal discrepancies. I would say, you know, probably less than a hundred. Q. So would you agree with me, then, that if there is a difference in pricing, it would probably be the result of how you price individual securities instead of— A. And not so much— Q. — the composition of the pool? A. And not so much— Q. — the composition of the pool? A. HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA Q. You'll see the — first of all, have you ever seen this document before? A. In preparation for the deposition, yes, but other than that, no. Q. Okay. You'll see on the cover page that this is dated Friday, September 26? A. Uh-huh. Q. And at the bottom of the covering email it mentions Schedule A, you see that? A. Okay. Q. It says here, "Our guys are still running the reconciliation to confirm that there are no errors in the Barclays list." Do you see that? A. Uh-huh. Q. And then if you turn to the last tab in the document, it's a lengthy schedule which concludes with a number, a figure on the last page— A. The last page? Q. — of 44, of approximately \$44.1 billion, do you see that? A. I do, yes. A. No. A. No. A. Ragin, another voluminous schedule, but take youl mad a chance to the, primarily, the first and last page. A. Okay. D. I was really going to ask you about the, primarily, the first and last page. A. Okay. D. I was really going to ask you about the, primarily, the first and last page. A. Okay. D. I was really going to ask you about the, primarily, the first			3	
there were minimal, minimal discrepancies. I hundred. bundred. Q. So would you agree with me, then, that if there is a difference in pricing, it would probably be the result of how you price individual securities instead of A. And not so much Q the composition of the pool? MR. SHAW: Objection to form. You need to let him finish his question and then let me object so we have a clean record. Page 132 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA Q. You'll see the first of all, have you ever seen this document before? A. In preparation for the deposition, yes, but other than that, no. Q. Okay. You'll see on the cover page that this is dated Friday, September 26? A. Uh-huh. Q. And a gain, it's a voluminous schedule, but take your time to review it. A. Uh-huh. A. Okay. (Document review.) A. Okay. Q. Mr. Hraska, have you had a chance to look at it briefly? A. I have, yes. Page 132 Page 133 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA understanding of why the value of this schedule is now at this point in time at \$44.1 billion as opposed to the 42.9 that we saw earlier? A. Okay. Q. And at the bottom of the pool? A. I have, yes. Page 132 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA understanding of why the value of this schedule is now at this point in time at \$44.1 billion as opposed to the 42.9 that we saw earlier? A. Okay. Q. It says here, "Our guys are still running the reconciliation to confirm that there are no errors in the Barclays list." Do you see that? A. Uh-huh. Q. And then if you turn to the last tab in the document, it's a lengthy schedule which concludes with a number, a figure on the last tab in the document, it's a lengthy schedule which concludes with a number, a figure on the last page A. The last page? Q of 44, of approximately \$44.1 billion, do you see that? A. I do, yes.			1	•
would say, you know, probably less than a hundred. Q. So would you agree with me, then, that if there is a difference in pricing, it would probably be the result of how you price individual securities instead of			14	
hundred. Q. So would you agree with me, then, that if there is a difference in pricing, it would probably be the result of how you price individual securities instead of A. And not so much Q. — the composition of the pool? MR. SHAW: Objection to form. You need to let him finish his question and then let me object so we have a clean record. Page 132 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA Q. You'll see the first of all, have you ever seen this document before? A. In preparation for the deposition, yes, but other than that, no. Q. Okay. You'll see on the cover page that this is dated Friday, September 26? A. Uh-huh. Q. And at the bottom of the covering e-mail it mentions Schedule A, you see that? A. Okay. Q. It says here, "Our guys are still running the reconciliation to confirm that there are no errors in the Barclays list." Do you see that? A. Uh-huh. Q. And then if you turn to the last tab in the document, it's a lengthy schedule which concludes with a number, a figure on the last tap page — A. The last page? Q. — of 44, of approximately \$44.1 billion, do you see that? A. I do, yes. A. I do, yes. Journal with, primarily, the first and last page. A. Okay. (Document review.) A. Okay. Q. Mr. Hraska, have you had a chance to look at it briefly? A. I have, yes. Page 132 Page 133 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA 1 understanding of why the value of this schedule of the securities embodied in the schedule is now at this point in time at \$44.1 billion as opposed to the 42.9 that we saw earlier? A. No is the short answer. We talked earlier about pricing differentials. So, to me, are the first about pricing differentials. So, to me, are the first about pricing differentials of the density and the dearlier about pricing differentials. So, to me, are the first about pricing differentials of the last tab, which is purportedly Schedule A? A. Well, this is an e-mail I wasn't included on. Q. Right. A. So it doesn't look like the format of any of the files that I produced, so that's why I'm assuming well, me bein			15	<u> </u>
Q. So would you agree with me, then, that if there is a difference in pricing, it would probably be the result of how you price individual securities instead of — 20 individual securities instead of — 21 A. And not so much — 22 Q. — the composition of the pool? 22 MR. SHAW: Objection to form. You need to let him finish his question and then let me object so we have a clean record. 24 Page 132 Page 132 Page 132 Page 133 Page — 25 Page 136 Page 137 Page 138 Page — 26 A. Uh-huh. 26 A. Uh-huh. 27 Q. And at the bottom of the covering e-mail it mentions Schedule A, you see that? 28 A. Uh-huh. 29 And then if you turn to the last tab in the document, it's a lengthy schedule which concludes with a number, a figure on the last tab page — 21 A. The last page? 22 Q. — of 44, of approximately \$44.1 billion a vou see that? 34 Ido, yes. 24 A. No.			1	
if there is a difference in pricing, it would probably be the result of how you price individual securities instead of — 20 individual securities instead of — 21 A. And not so much — 21 Q. — the composition of the pool? 22 A. And not so much — 21 hockey. (Document review.) A. Okay. (Document review.) A. Inavc review. (Document review.) A. Okay. (Document review.) A. No is the short in the at \$44.1 billion as opposed to the \$42.9 that we saw earlier? A. No is the short answer. We talked earlier about pricing differentials. So, to me, I don't know whether this is a Lehman-produced or Barclays produced it. It docs	1		17	•
probably be the result of how you price individual securifies instead of — 20 individual securifies instead of — 21 A. And not so much — 22 Q. — the composition of the pool? 22 A. Okay. 23 (Document review.) A. Okay. 24 need to let him finish his question and then let me object so we have a clean record. 25 A. I have, yes. 27 A. I have, yes. 28 Page 132 Page 132 Page 133 Page — 20 Mr. Hraska, have you had a chance to look at it briefly? A. I have, yes. 29 A. Okay. 40 Mr. Hraska, have you had a chance to look at it briefly? A. I have, yes. 41 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – J. HRASKA 20 You'll see the — first of all, have 21 you ever seen this document before? 32 A. In preparation for the deposition, 32 yes, but other than that, no. 33 yes, but other than that, no. 34 you ever seen this document before? 35 yes, but other than that, no. 36 Q. Okay. You'll see on the cover page 36 that this is dated Friday, September 26? 4. A. Uh-huh. 4. 10 Q. And at the bottom of the covering 36 e-mail it mentions Schedule A, you see that? 4. Okay. 4. Well, this is an e-mail I wasn't included on. 4. Well, this is an e-mail I w	1		18	
Individual securities instead of — A. And not so much — Q. — the composition of the pool? A. And not so much — Q. — the composition of the pool? A. MR. SHAW: Objection to form. You need to let him finish his question and then let me object so we have a clean record. Page 132 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA Q. You'll see the — first of all, have you ever seen this document before? A. In preparation for the deposition, yes, but other than that, no. Q. Okay. You'll see on the cover page that this is dated Friday, September 26? A. Uh-huh. Q. And at the bottom of the covering e-mail it mentions Schedule A, you see that? A. Okay. Q. It says here, "Our guys are still running the reconciliation to confirm that there are no errors in the Barclays list." Do you see that? A. Uh-huh. Q. And then if you turn to the last tab in the document, it's a lengthy schedule which concludes with a number, a figure on the last page — A. The last page? A. I do, yes. A. I do, yes. A. Okay. Q. Mr. Hraska, have you had a chance to look at it briefly? A. Okay. Page 132 Page 133 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA understanding of why the value of this schedule is now at this point in time at \$44.1 billion as opposed to the 42.9 that we saw earlier? A. No is the short answer. We talked earlier about pricing differentials. So, to me, I don't know whether this is a Lehman-produced or Barclays produced it. It doesn't appear to me to be a Lehman-produced, so Q. When you say it doesn't appear to be a Lehman-produced document, are you referring to the last tab, which is purportedly Schedule A? A. Well, this is an e-mail I wasn't included on. Q. Right. A. So it doesn't look like the format of any of the files that I produced, so that's why I'm assuming — well, me being Lehman at the time, Lehman-produced. Q. Okay. Do you recall the figure \$44.1 billion, do you see that? A. I do, yes.	1	- • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	19	
A. And not so much— Q. —the composition of the pool? A. Okay. Page 132 I HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA Q. You'll see the — first of all, have you vere seen this document before? A. In preparation for the deposition, yes, but other than that, no. Q. Okay. You'll see on the cover page that this is dated Friday, September 26? A. Uh-huh. Q. And at the bottom of the covering e-mail it mentions Schedule A, you see that? A. Okay. Q. It says here, "Our guys are still running the reconciliation to confirm that there are no errors in the Barclays list." Do you see that? A. Uh-huh. Q. And then if you turn to the last tab in the document, it's a lengthy schedule which concludes with a number, a figure on the last page — A. The last page? A. I do, yes. Concument review.) A. Okay. Q. Mr. Hraska, have you had a chance to look at it briefly? A. I have, yes. Page 132			1	-
Q. —the composition of the pool? MR. SHAW: Objection to form. You need to let him finish his question and then let me object so we have a clean record. Page 132 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA Q. You'll see the first of all, have you ever seen this document before? A. In preparation for the deposition, yes, but other than that, no. Q. Okay. You'll see on the cover page that this is dated Friday, September 26? A. Uh-huh. Q. And at the bottom of the covering e-mail it mentions Schedule A, you see that? A. Okay. Q. It says here, "Our guys are still running the reconciliation to confirm that there are no errors in the Barclays list." Do you see that? A. Uh-huh. Q. And then if you turn to the last tab in the document, it's a lengthy schedule which concludes with a number, a figure on the last page - A. The last page? A. I do, yes. A. Okay. Q. Okay. Do you recall the figure \$44.1 billion, do you see that? A. Okay. Q. When you say it doesn't appear to be a Lehman-produced document, are you referring to the last tab, which is purportedly Schedule A? A. Well, this is an e-mail I wasn't included on. Q. Right. A. So it doesn't look like the format of any of the files that I produced, so that's why I'm assuming well, me being Lehman at the time, Lehman-produced. Q. Okay. Do you recall the figure \$44.1 billion, do you see that? A. Okay. A. Well, this is an e-mail I wasn't included on. Q. Right. A. So it doesn't look like the format of any of the files that I produced, so that's why I'm assuming well, me being Lehman at the time, Lehman-produced. Q. Okay. Do you recall the figure \$44.1 billion, do you see that? A. No.			21	•
A. In preparation for the deposition, yes, but other than that, no. Q. And at the bottom of the covering e-mail it mentions Schedule A, you see that? A. Okay. Q. It says here, "Our guys are still running the reconciliation to confirm that there that? A. Uh-huh. Q. And then if you turn to the last tab in the document, it's a lengthy schedule with a number, a figure on the last page A. The last page? A. I have, yes. Page 132 A. I have, yes. Page 133 A. I have, yes. Page 133 A. I have, yes. Page 134 A. I have, yes. Page 135 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA understanding of why the value of this schedule is now at this point in time at \$44.1 billion as opposed to the 42.9 that we saw earlier? A. No is the short answer. We talked earlier about pricing differentials. So, to me, I don't know whether this is a Lehman-produced or Barclays produced it. It doesn't appear to be a Lehman-produced, so Q. When you say it doesn't appear to be a Lehman-produced document, are you referring to the last tab, which is purportedly Schedule A? A. Well, this is an e-mail I wasn't included on. Q. Right. A. Well, this is an e-mail I wasn't included on. Q. Right. A. Well, this is an e-mail I wasn't included on. Q. Right. A. Well, this is an e-mail I wasn't included on. Q. Right. A. So it doesn't look like the format of any of the files that I produced, so that's why I'm assuming well, me being Lehman at the time, Lehman-produced. Q. Okay. Do you recall the figure \$44.1 billion, do you see that? A. I do, yes.		O the composition of the pool?	22	
24 need to let him finish his question and then let me object so we have a clean record.			23	
let me object so we have a clean record. Page 132 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA Q. You'll see the first of all, have you ever seen this document before? A. In preparation for the deposition, yes, but other than that, no. Q. Okay. You'll see on the cover page that this is dated Friday, September 26? A. Uh-huh. Q. And at the bottom of the covering e-mail it mentions Schedule A, you see that? A. Okay. Q. It says here, "Our guys are still running the reconciliation to confirm that there are no errors in the Barclays list." Do you see that? A. Uh-huh. Q. And then if you turn to the last tab in the document, it's a lengthy schedule which concludes with a number, a figure on the last page - A. The last page? A. I have, yes. Page 133 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA understanding of why the value of this schedule of the securities embodied in the schedule is now at this point in time at \$44.1 billion as opposed to the 42.9 that we saw earlier? A. No is the short answer. We talked earlier about pricing differentials. So, to me, I don't know whether this is a Lehman-produced or Barclays produced it. It doesn't appear to me to be a Lehman-produced, so Q. When you say it doesn't appear to be a Lehman-produced document, are you referring to the last tab, which is purportedly Schedule A? A. Well, this is an e-mail I wasn't included on. Q. Right. A. So it doesn't look like the format of any of the files that I produced, so that's why Pm assuming well, me being Lehman at the time, Lehman-produced. Q. Okay. Do you recall the figure \$44.1 billion ever being used in connection with the value of the securities on Schedule A? A. No.		_	24	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA Q. You'll see the first of all, have you ever seen this document before? A. In preparation for the deposition, yes, but other than that, no. Q. Okay. You'll see on the cover page that this is dated Friday, September 26? A. Uh-huh. Q. And at the bottom of the covering e-mail it mentions Schedule A, you see that? A. Okay. Q. It says here, "Our guys are still running the reconciliation to confirm that there are no errors in the Barclays list." Do you see that? A. Uh-huh. Q. And then if you turn to the last tab in the document, it's a lengthy schedule which concludes with a number, a figure on the last page A. The last page? A. It do, yes. HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA understanding of why the value of this schedule of the securities embodied in the schedule is now at this point in time at \$44.1 billion as opposed to the 42.9 that we saw earlier? A. No is the short answer. We talked earlier about pricing differentials. So, to me, I don't know whether this is a Lehman-produced or Barclays produced it. It doesn't appear to me to be a Lehman-produced document, are you referring to the last tab, which is purportedly Schedule A? A. Well, this is an e-mail I wasn't included on. Q. Right. A. So it doesn't look like the format of any of the files that I produced, so that's why I'm assuming well, me being Lehman at the time, Lehman-produced. Q. Okay. Do you recall the figure \$44.1 billion, do you see that? A. No.	25	let me object so we have a clean record.	25	A. I have, yes.
Q. You'll see the — first of all, have you ever seen this document before? A. In preparation for the deposition, yes, but other than that, no. Q. Okay. You'll see on the cover page that this is dated Friday, September 26? A. Uh-huh. Q. And at the bottom of the covering e-mail it mentions Schedule A, you see that? A. Okay. Q. It says here, "Our guys are still running the reconciliation to confirm that there are no errors in the Barclays list." Do you see that? A. Uh-huh. Q. And then if you turn to the last tab in the document, it's a lengthy schedule which concludes with a number, a figure on the last page — A. The last page? A. I do, yes. Q. Vou'll see the — first of all, have you evel that so fit he securities embodied in the schedule is now at this point in time at \$44.1 billion as opposed to the 42.9 that we saw earlier? A. No is the short answer. We talked earlier about pricing differentials. So, to me, I don't know whether this is a Lehman-produced or Barclays produced it. It doesn't appear to me to be a Lehman-produced document, are you referring to the last tab, which is purportedly Schedule A? A. Well, this is an e-mail I wasn't included on. Q. Right. A. So it doesn't look like the format of any of the files that I produced, so that's why I'm assuming — well, me being Lehman at the time, Lehman-produced. Q. Okay. Do you recall the figure \$44.1 billion ever being used in connection with the value of the securities on Schedule A? A. No.	***************************************	Page 132		Page 133
Q. You'll see the — first of all, have you ever seen this document before? A. In preparation for the deposition, yes, but other than that, no. Q. Okay. You'll see on the cover page that this is dated Friday, September 26? A. Uh-huh. Q. And at the bottom of the covering e-mail it mentions Schedule A, you see that? A. Okay. Q. It says here, "Our guys are still running the reconciliation to confirm that there are no errors in the Barclays list." Do you see that? A. Uh-huh. Q. And then if you turn to the last tab in the document, it's a lengthy schedule which concludes with a number, a figure on the last page — A. The last page? A. I do, yes. Q. Vou'll see the — first of all, have you evel that so fit he securities embodied in the schedule is now at this point in time at \$44.1 billion as opposed to the 42.9 that we saw earlier? A. No is the short answer. We talked earlier about pricing differentials. So, to me, I don't know whether this is a Lehman-produced or Barclays produced it. It doesn't appear to me to be a Lehman-produced document, are you referring to the last tab, which is purportedly Schedule A? A. Well, this is an e-mail I wasn't included on. Q. Right. A. So it doesn't look like the format of any of the files that I produced, so that's why I'm assuming — well, me being Lehman at the time, Lehman-produced. Q. Okay. Do you recall the figure \$44.1 billion ever being used in connection with the value of the securities on Schedule A? A. No.	1	HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA	1	HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA
3 you ever seen this document before? 4 A. In preparation for the deposition, 5 yes, but other than that, no. 6 Q. Okay. You'll see on the cover page 7 that this is dated Friday, September 26? 8 A. Uh-huh. 9 Q. And at the bottom of the covering 10 e-mail it mentions Schedule A, you see that? 11 A. Okay. 12 Q. It says here, "Our guys are still 13 running the reconciliation to confirm that there 14 are no errors in the Barclays list." Do you see that? 15 that? 16 A. Uh-huh. 17 Q. And then if you turn to the last tab in the document, it's a lengthy schedule which concludes with a number, a figure on the last tab page 21 A. The last page? 22 Q of 44, of approximately \$44.1 billion as opposed to the 42.9 that we saw earlier? 4 A. No is the short answer. We talked earlier about pricing differentials. So, to me, 1 don't know whether this is a Lehman-produced or Barclays produced it. It doesn't appear to be a Lehman-produced document, are you referring to the last tab, which is purportedly Schedule A? 4 A. Well, this is an e-mail I wasn't included on. 2 Q. Right. 4 A. So it doesn't look like the format of any of the files that I produced, so that's why 1 I'm assuming well, me being Lehman at the time, Lehman-produced. 4 Q. Okay. Do you recall the figure \$44.1 billion ever being used in connection with the value of the securities on Schedule A? 4 A. No.			1	
A. In preparation for the deposition, yes, but other than that, no. Q. Okay. You'll see on the cover page that this is dated Friday, September 26? A. Uh-huh. Q. And at the bottom of the covering e-mail it mentions Schedule A, you see that? A. Okay. Q. It says here, "Our guys are still running the reconciliation to confirm that there are no errors in the Barclays list." Do you see that? A. Uh-huh. Q. And then if you turn to the last tab in the document, it's a lengthy schedule which concludes with a number, a figure on the last page. A. It do, yes. A. It do, yes. A. In preparation for the deposition, yes, but other than that, no. A. Okay. You'll see on the cover page A. No is the short answer. We talked earlier about pricing differentials. So, to me, I don't know whether this is a Lehman-produced or Barclays produced it. It doesn't appear to be a Lehman-produced, so Q. When you say it doesn't appear to be a Lehman-produced document, are you referring to the last tab, which is purportedly Schedule A? A. Well, this is an e-mail I wasn't included on. Q. Right. A. So it doesn't look like the format of any of the files that I produced, so that's why I'm assuming well, me being Lehman at the time, Lehman-produced. Q. Okay. Do you recall the figure \$44.1 billion ever being used in connection with the value of the securities on Schedule A? A. No.	1		1	
yes, but other than that, no. Q. Okay. You'll see on the cover page that this is dated Friday, September 26? A. Uh-huh. Q. And at the bottom of the covering e-mail it mentions Schedule A, you see that? A. Okay. Q. It says here, "Our guys are still running the reconciliation to confirm that there are no errors in the Barclays list." Do you see that? A. Uh-huh. Q. And then if you turn to the last tab in the document, it's a lengthy schedule which concludes with a number, a figure on the last page. A. I do, yes. Dopposed to the 42.9 that we saw earlier? A. No is the short answer. We talked earlier about pricing differentials. So, to me, I don't know whether this is a Lehman-produced or Barclays produced it. It doesn't appear to me to be a Lehman-produced, so Q. When you say it doesn't appear to be a Lehman-produced document, are you referring to the last tab, which is purportedly Schedule A? A. Well, this is an e-mail I wasn't included on. Q. Right. A. So it doesn't look like the format of any of the files that I produced, so that's why I'm assuming well, me being Lehman at the time, Lehman-produced. Q. Okay. Do you recall the figure \$44.1 billion, do you see that? A. No.	1	· ·	4	
6 Q. Okay. You'll see on the cover page 7 that this is dated Friday, September 26? 8 A. Uh-huh. 9 Q. And at the bottom of the covering 10 e-mail it mentions Schedule A, you see that? 11 A. Okay. 12 Q. It says here, "Our guys are still 13 running the reconciliation to confirm that there are no errors in the Barclays list." Do you see that? 14 a. Uh-huh. 15 that? 16 A. Uh-huh. 17 Q. And then if you turn to the last tab in the document, it's a lengthy schedule which concludes with a number, a figure on the last page 14 A. The last page? 15 billion, do you see that? 16 A. I do, yes. 17 A. No is the short answer. We talked earlier about pricing differentials. So, to me, 18 I don't know whether this is a Lehman-produced or Barclays produced it. It doesn't appear to me to be a Lehman-produced, so 16 Q. When you say it doesn't appear to be a Lehman-produced document, are you referring to the last tab, which is purportedly Schedule A? 18 A. Well, this is an e-mail I wasn't included on. 19 Q. Right. 10 A. So it doesn't look like the format of any of the files that I produced, so that's why I'm assuming well, me being Lehman at the time, Lehman-produced. 19 Q. Okay. Do you recall the figure \$44.1 billion ever being used in connection with the value of the securities on Schedule A? 20 A. No.	5		5	
that this is dated Friday, September 26? A. Uh-huh. Q. And at the bottom of the covering e-mail it mentions Schedule A, you see that? A. Okay. Q. It says here, "Our guys are still running the reconciliation to confirm that there are no errors in the Barclays list." Do you see that? A. Uh-huh. A. Uh-huh. Q. When you say it doesn't appear to me to be a Lehman-produced, so Q. When you say it doesn't appear to be a Lehman-produced document, are you referring to the last tab, which is purportedly Schedule A? A. Well, this is an e-mail I wasn't included on. Q. Right. A. So it doesn't look like the format of any of the files that I produced, so that's why I'm assuming well, me being Lehman at the time, Lehman-produced. A. The last page? Q of 44, of approximately \$44.1 billion, do you see that? A. I do, yes.	1	-	1	* *
A. Uh-huh. Q. And at the bottom of the covering e-mail it mentions Schedule A, you see that? A. Okay. It says here, "Our guys are still running the reconciliation to confirm that there are no errors in the Barclays list." Do you see that? A. Uh-huh. Q. And then if you turn to the last tab in the document, it's a lengthy schedule which concludes with a number, a figure on the last page - A. The last page? A. I do, yes. I don't know whether this is a Lehman-produced or Barclays produced it. It doesn't appear to me to be a Lehman-produced, so Q. When you say it doesn't appear to be a Lehman-produced document, are you referring to the last tab, which is purportedly Schedule A? A. Well, this is an e-mail I wasn't included on. Q. Right. A. So it doesn't look like the format of any of the files that I produced, so that's why I'm assuming well, me being Lehman at the time, Lehman-produced. Q. Okay. Do you recall the figure \$44.1 billion, do you see that? A. I do, yes.	7		7	
9 Q. And at the bottom of the covering e-mail it mentions Schedule A, you see that? 1 A. Okay. 1 Q. It says here, "Our guys are still running the reconciliation to confirm that there are no errors in the Barclays list." Do you see that? 1 A. Uh-huh. 1 Q. And then if you turn to the last tab in the document, it's a lengthy schedule which page 2 A. The last page? 2 A. I do, yes. 9 or Barclays produced it. It doesn't appear to me to be a Lehman-produced, so Q. When you say it doesn't appear to be a Lehman-produced document, are you referring to the last tab, which is purportedly Schedule A? A. Well, this is an e-mail I wasn't included on. Q. Right. A. So it doesn't look like the format of any of the files that I produced, so that's why I'm assuming well, me being Lehman at the time, Lehman-produced. Q. Okay. Do you recall the figure \$44.1 billion, do you see that? A. I do, yes. 4 A. No.	8		8	
e-mail it mentions Schedule A, you see that? A. Okay. Q. It says here, "Our guys are still running the reconciliation to confirm that there are no errors in the Barclays list." Do you see that? A. Uh-huh. Q. And then if you turn to the last tab in the document, it's a lengthy schedule which concludes with a number, a figure on the last page A. The last page? A. The last page? A. I do, yes. A. I do, yes. A. Well, this is an e-mail I wasn't included on. Q. Right. A. So it doesn't look like the format of any of the files that I produced, so that's why I'm assuming well, me being Lehman at the time, Lehman-produced. Q. Okay. Do you recall the figure \$44.1 billion ever being used in connection with the value of the securities on Schedule A? A. I do, yes.	9	Q. And at the bottom of the covering	9	or Barclays produced it. It doesn't appear to
A. Okay. Q. It says here, "Our guys are still running the reconciliation to confirm that there are no errors in the Barclays list." Do you see that? A. Uh-huh. Q. And then if you turn to the last tab in the document, it's a lengthy schedule which concludes with a number, a figure on the last page - A. The last page? A. The last page? A. I do, yes. A. I do, yes. A. Okay. Q. When you say it doesn't appear to be a Lehman-produced document, are you referring to the last tab, which is purportedly Schedule A? A. Well, this is an e-mail I wasn't included on. Q. Right. A. So it doesn't look like the format of any of the files that I produced, so that's why I'm assuming well, me being Lehman at the time, Lehman-produced. Q. Okay. Do you recall the figure \$44.1 billion ever being used in connection with the value of the securities on Schedule A? A. I do, yes.	10	-	10	
running the reconciliation to confirm that there are no errors in the Barclays list." Do you see that? A. Uh-huh. Q. And then if you turn to the last tab in the document, it's a lengthy schedule which concludes with a number, a figure on the last page A. The last page? Q of 44, of approximately \$44.1 billion, do you see that? A. Well, this is an e-mail I wasn't included on. Q. Right. A. So it doesn't look like the format of any of the files that I produced, so that's why I'm assuming well, me being Lehman at the time, Lehman-produced. Q. Okay. Do you recall the figure \$44.1 billion ever being used in connection with the value of the securities on Schedule A? A. No.	11		11	Q. When you say it doesn't appear to be a
are no errors in the Barclays list." Do you see that? A. Well, this is an e-mail I wasn't included on. A. Uh-huh. Q. Right. A. So it doesn't look like the format of any of the files that I produced, so that's why I'm assuming well, me being Lehman at the time, Lehman-produced. A. The last page? A. The last page? Q. Okay. Do you recall the figure \$44.1 billion, do you see that? A. I do, yes.	12	Q. It says here, "Our guys are still	12	Lehman-produced document, are you referring to
that? A. Uh-huh. Q. Right. Q. And then if you turn to the last tab in the document, it's a lengthy schedule which concludes with a number, a figure on the last page - A. The last page? Q of 44, of approximately \$44.1 billion, do you see that? A. I do, yes. 15 included on. Q. Right. A. So it doesn't look like the format of any of the files that I produced, so that's why I'm assuming well, me being Lehman at the time, Lehman-produced. Q. Okay. Do you recall the figure \$44.1 billion ever being used in connection with the value of the securities on Schedule A? A. I do, yes.	13	running the reconciliation to confirm that there	13	the last tab, which is purportedly Schedule A?
A. Uh-huh. Q. And then if you turn to the last tab in the document, it's a lengthy schedule which concludes with a number, a figure on the last page A. The last page? Q. Right. A. So it doesn't look like the format of any of the files that I produced, so that's why I'm assuming well, me being Lehman at the time, Lehman-produced. Q. Okay. Do you recall the figure \$44.1 billion, do you see that? A. I do, yes. Q. A. No.		are no errors in the Barclays list." Do you see	14	
Q. And then if you turn to the last tab in the document, it's a lengthy schedule which concludes with a number, a figure on the last page A. The last page? Q of 44, of approximately \$44.1 billion, do you see that? A. So it doesn't look like the format of any of the files that I produced, so that's why I'm assuming well, me being Lehman at the time, Lehman-produced. Q. Okay. Do you recall the figure \$44.1 billion ever being used in connection with the value of the securities on Schedule A? A. I do, yes.		that?	15	included on.
in the document, it's a lengthy schedule which concludes with a number, a figure on the last page - A. The last page? Q of 44, of approximately \$44.1 billion, do you see that? A. I do, yes. any of the files that I produced, so that's why I'm assuming well, me being Lehman at the time, Lehman-produced. Q. Okay. Do you recall the figure \$44.1 billion ever being used in connection with the value of the securities on Schedule A? A. No.	1		8	-
19 concludes with a number, a figure on the last 20 page 21 A. The last page? 22 Q of 44, of approximately \$44.1 23 billion, do you see that? 24 A. I do, yes. 29 I'm assuming well, me being Lehman at the time, Lehman-produced. Q. Okay. Do you recall the figure \$44.1 billion ever being used in connection with the value of the securities on Schedule A? A. No.		=	8	
page 20 time, Lehman-produced. A. The last page? 21 Q. Okay. Do you recall the figure \$44.1 Q. Okay. Do you recall the figure \$44.1 billion, do you see that? 23 billion, do you see that? 24 A. I do, yes. 24 A. No.		_ _ •	8	
A. The last page? Q. Okay. Do you recall the figure \$44.1 Q. Okay. Do you recall the figure \$44.1 billion ever being used in connection with the value of the securities on Schedule A? A. I do, yes. Q. Okay. Do you recall the figure \$44.1 22 billion ever being used in connection with the value of the securities on Schedule A? A. I do, yes.		concludes with a number, a figure on the last	1	
22 Q of 44, of approximately \$44.1 23 billion, do you see that? 24 A. I do, yes. 25 billion ever being used in connection with the value of the securities on Schedule A? 26 A. No.			8	
billion, do you see that? 23 value of the securities on Schedule A? 24 A. I do, yes. 24 A. No.	1		\$	
24 A. I do, yes. 24 A. No.			8	-
1		•	3	
Q. And so my question is, do you have any 25 Q. And I think you said earlier, but I		• •	8	
	ξ2	Q. And so my question is, do you have any	¥5	Q. And I think you said earlier, but I

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 134

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA

just want to get a clarification, that other folks, if there was a reconciliation as to value, it was being done by other people other than yourself?

- A. The two finance organizations.
- Q. And I think you gave me names, but I forgot them. Is that Mr. Reilly?
- A. Mr. Reilly's organization, right, and then I know it's Marty Klein now. I'm not sure who was head -- if it was Marty. I think Marty Klein was legacy Lehman, so I'm not sure who was in the finance organization at the time. I think you had Jason Yang or some of those guys. Yeah, Jason Yang was involved.
- Q. So am I correct in assuming that you really don't have any knowledge as to the -- how this \$44.1 billion figure was arrived at?
 - A. That's correct.
 - Q. Okay.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

LΟ

11

12

13

14

15

. 6

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

.0

11

2

3

4

15

L 6

١7

L 8

9

20

21

22

23

24

(Exhibit 141B, a document bearing Bates Nos. BCI-CG00055192 through 55629, marked for identification, as of this date.)

Q. Mr. Hraska, I'm handing you a copy of a document marked as Exhibit 142B.

Page 135

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA

- A. Mine is marked 141. Do I have the wrong one?
- Q. 141B, I apologize. It's Bates-stamped BCI-CG-0055192 through 55629. Please take a minute to review it. If it helps in your review, my questions are going to involve the cover page and the page marked 55519, which is a little more than halfway through the document.

(Document review.)

- A. Could you please repeat the middle page you said you wanted me to read?
 - Q. The page ending in 55519. MR. SHAW: You mean 55319? MR. HINE: No, 55519.
 - A. Okay.
 - Q. So CG55519.
 - A. Okav.
- Q. Have you had a chance to look at the document briefly?
 - A. I have, yes.
- Q. Have you ever seen this document before?
- A. Again, not before the preparation for this deposition.

Page 136

Page 137

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA

Q. Okay. Does this look like a schedule that was prepared by Lehman or Barclays?

- A. It does not look like it's a schedule that I prepared, so ...
- Q. Okay. You'll see on the cover page it mentions the fact that this includes two attachments, one of which is Schedule A and one a Schedule B, do you see that?

A. I do.

MR. SHAW: Objection.

Mischaracterizes the document.

Q. Okay.

MR. SHAW: Schedule B, Part 1.

MR. HINE: Okay.

- Q. Mr. Hraska, what is Schedule B, Part 1?
 - A. I honestly don't know.
- Q. Have you ever seen Schedule B broken into Parts 1 or 2?
 - A. No.
- Q. If you could turn to the page we had been discussing, which is the one ending in Bates stamp 55519, you'll see this comes to a \$42.9 billion figure, correct?

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA

- A. That's correct.
- Q. Now, my question is along the lines of the prior questions: Do you have any explanation of how, after a few weeks of discussion, the figure appears to have gotten back to \$42.9 billion after there were previous iterations where the numbers of 45 and 44 billion bandied about?

A. Well, what I can tell you is that 42.9 is the number that I recognize, which is I believe we confirmed in the previous documents. So this number to me is familiar, and I would agree that that was what I knew the value to be.

I don't know how it got back to that. I don't know -- this is just -- because it's a large document. It could be that somewhere else it's referenced still 44. I haven't gone through every page. But I can tell you that this number is the number that I recognized and I maintain to recognize as the value of what we transferred.

Q. So in your -- again, I'm not trying to trick you.

A. No. No.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

. 6

<u>L</u>7

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 138

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA

Q. I know you're not — you didn't recognize some of the other numbers we just talked about. So, in your mind, approximately 42.9 billion is the value of the securities on Schedule A, correct?

MR. SHAW: Objection.

Mischaracterizes. You can --

- A. It was the value that I knew at the time of transfer, and whether or not that value changed or was subsequently discussed, I don't know, but it was the value that I knew at the time of transfer.
- Q. Okay. And you weren't involved in any discussions about other values with respect to that schedule, correct?
 - A. No.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

0

1

2

.3

4

. 5

6

.7

. 8

9

20

<u></u>21

22

23

24

25

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

.0

.1

2

.3

4

.5

. 6

17

8

9

20

21

22

23

24

Q. And do you think that's the value in your mind of the final version of Schedule A?

MR. SHAW: Objection to form.

- A. Again, I don't know if it was the final version. I know it was the value when I transferred it.
- Q. Maybe that was a bad question. Did Schedule A change in composition, to your

Page 139

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA knowledge, from the original chart that we looked at?

- A. In composition of securities? The number of securities and things like that? The schedule did not change. The pricing may have changed.
- Q. Okay. But you don't have any knowledge of whether the pricing changed?
- A. Other than the knowledge of looking at these documents here, there's obviously a discrepancy, but no upfront knowledge that it changed.
- Q. And you don't have any knowledge of the value of any securities on Schedule A being written down in connection with this reconciliation process?
- A. No. You asked that earlier, right? No.
- Q. Do you recall what the par value was for the security listed on Schedule A?
 - A. I don't, no.
- Q. Okay. That's all I have with that document.

Mr. Hraska, you were involved in

Page 141

Page 140 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA

preparing Schedule B, correct?

- A. I was involved in giving a list of unencumbered collateral, which I understand some of which became Schedule B.
- Q. But you're not familiar with the terms Part 1 and Part 2 of Schedule B; is that right?
 - A. No.
- Q. Are you familiar with any kind of discussions about the valuation of the securities that are on Schedule B?
- A. Well, there was the valuation that I knew to have transferred, which is 1.4 billion. I don't know what the ultimate valuation of that or the I don't know what the final version of that list was or the market value associated with that, so ...
- Q. Do you recall any discussions about any discrepancies in the valuation of the securities that comprised Schedule B?
- A. I remember there being discussions in valuation of those securities, discrepancies in general. I don't know whether they were specifically Schedule B or if they were just purely related to the repo we were discussing

 $\label{eq:highly confidential - J. HRASKA earlier, so ...} HRASKA$ earlier, so ...

- Q. Well, I guess I'm just trying to -was there a reconciliation process that went on with respect to the securities in Schedule B?
- A. There was a -- there was a reconciliation process from the standpoint of we were asked what securities were delivered, which we provided to the Finance folks, and the Finance folks did a spreadsheet compared to what they knew to be Schedule B and at one point told us something along the lines of -- I don't remember whether it was 800 Cusips or 800 million in value, but there was a number of 800, which whatever was the discrepancy on that. I believe it was Cusips.

Q. 800 Cusips?

A. 800 Cusips or security identifiers which weren't delivered.

- Q. And was that reconciled in some way? MR. SHAW: Objection to form.
- A. The Cusips in question were looked at by the Clearance folks and my teams as to whether they were delivered or whether they could be delivered, and we verified that in fact

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

116

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 142

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA they were not delivered.

Q. And was there any effort to then deliver them later?

A. There was an effort to see if they were available for delivery, and in most instances, they were actually not available for delivery.

Q. So was any further action taken on that?

A. For that -- for the particular securities on that list, no.

Q. Were substitute securities delivered instead?

A. Substitute securities were not delivered.

Let me just think about that. Yeah, no, there was no substitute securities delivered after that, no.

Q. Was that possibility considered?

MR. SHAW: Objection to form, foundation.

A. That possibility was considered.

There was conversations that I had with the

Treasury folks, who were prior legacy Lehman,

Page 143

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA but now, as a result of the timing, were now employed by Barclays, so Robert Azerad and those folks, as to whether or not there were other securities which were unencumbered that could be substituted for the securities that could not be delivered on the original Schedule B.

Q. And what was the result of that discussion?

A. The result of that discussion was is that we went through yet again another identification process to try to locate unencumbered securities that were available or that could be made available to transfer. At that point in time, by then, we no longer had capability to just go ahead and make a transfer. It would have been subject to approval by Deloitte and a few other folks before anything could be done.

O. So where does that effort now stand?

A. The effort basically concluded with a subsequent set of lists that, you know, we feel are securities that are eligible to be transferred to Barclays.

Q. And why have they not been

Page 145

Page 144 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA

transferred?

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

0

. 1

2

.3

4

5

6

17

8

9

20

21 22

23

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

.0

1

.2

.3

. 4

.5

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. SHAW: Objection to form and foundation.

A. The clearance boxes in which they reside are presently under administration. So, as Barclays employees, we wouldn't have the ability to go and make those transfers without the administration's approval.

Q. So does Barclays thinks it's entitled to these securities?

A. I'm not a hundred percent sure what Barclays thinks. I was asked to go find something that was unencumbered in the Lehman boxes, which I did. I would speculate that Barclays would think they're entitled if they asked me to do that exercise.

Q. Who would know at Barclays whether they think they're entitled to those securities?

MR. SHAW: Objection to form, foundation.

A. I would start with the Treasury team and possibly the Legal team.

Q. And who is the Treasury team to which you are referring?

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA

A. Robert Azerad would be the point person that I would use, or Alan Kaplan in Legal.

Q. Can you tell me an approximate value for those securities that are -- that you identified that were not able to be transferred?

A. I would say 6 to 7 hundred million.

Q. And that's based on Lehman valuations?

A. Based on Lehman valuations at a particular point in time, which was November 17 of 2008.

Q. Just so I have a little clarity, this effort to identify these additional securities took place after you transferred over to Barclays?

A. That's correct.

Q. Did it start during the weekend of September 20th at all?

A. This particular exercise, no. It started I would say early October.

Q. Okay. We had -- in discussing Schedule A, I think you said there was a reconciliation effort, but to the extent there was an effort to reconcile the values, that's

	Page 146		Page 147
1	HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA	1	HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA
2	really not something that fell under your	2	those securities were in fact delivered.
3	purview; is that right?	3	Q. And were they?
4	A. That's correct.	4	A. They were not. Well, securities that
5	Q. Now, is that the same case for	5	were delivered were delivered, but the
6	reconciliation efforts related to Schedule B?	6	securities that were given as an exception were
7	A. With regards to the valuation?	7	not delivered.
8	Q. Yes.	8	Q. And that's the 800 Cusips you
9	A. Yes.	9	mentioned?
10	Q. So who would I ask about that if I	10	A. That's approximately 800, somewhere in
11	_	11	that number.
12	values related to Schedule B?	12	MR. SHAW: Does it make sense to take
13	A. Robert Azerad would be your best	13	a lunch break sometime soon?
14	source.	1.4	MR. HINE: Let me just finish up on
15	Q. Am I correct to say that you were, to	1.5	this.
16	the extent you were involved in reconciling	1.6	Q. Other than those 800 Cusips that you
17	anything with respect to Schedule B, it would be	17	mentioned, were there any other discrepancies
18	9	18	that you came across in your efforts to
19	V 8	19	reconcile the transfer of securities under
20	, 8	20	Schedule B?
21	,	21	A. Under Schedule B, no.
22	,	22	Q. So am I correct to say I think
23	· •	23	previously you used the phrase "tie-in." Did
24		24	your Lehman's records of the transfers for
25	Schedule B, and we were asked to verify that	25	Schedule B securities tie in with the Barclays
	Page 148		Page 149
1	HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA	1	HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA
2	records other than this 800 Cusips that you	2	AFTERNOON SESSION
3	mentioned?	3	(Time Noted: 1:19 P.M.)
4	A. Yes.	4	JAMES HRASKA, resumed and
5	MR. HINE: Why don't we break for	5	testified further as follows:
6	lunch.	6	EXAMINATION BY (Cont'd.)
7	THE WITNESS: Okay. That would be	7	MR. HINE:
8	great. Thanks.	8	Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Hraska.
9	(Recess; Time noted: 12:34 P.M.)	9	A. Good afternoon.
10		10	Q. I just had a couple of follow-up
11		11	questions with some of the schedules we talked
12		12	about. Just look briefly at 84B. That's the
13		13	one where your name is misspelled on the front
14		14	page. You see that?
15		1.5	A. Okay. That's correct.
16		16	Q. I think I see some e-mails that
17		17	suggest you did eventually get this document; is
18		18 19	that right?
19		19 20	A. I may have. I, honestly, I don't
20 b1		1	know. O. You don't recall?
21 22		21 22	Q. You don't recall? A. No.
23 23		23	Q. Okay. That's fine. That's all I had
24 24		2.3 2.4	on this one. I just wanted to clarify that one
25		25	issue.
			abbass.

Page 150 Page 151 1 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA 1 2 2 A. No. No. I don't know. If we look at Exhibit 141B, Mr. 3 3 O. You don't know one way or the other? Tonucci's name at the top. You see that? 4 4 A. Yes. A. Yeah. 5 5 O. Okay. So do those titles -- for Q. I think you testified that you didn't 6 example, it says, "Corrected Thursday transfers 6 recognize the format of some of the schedules we 7 to Barclays. BONY agreed." Is that a file that 7 were talking about, but I just wanted to ask you 8 8 you're familiar with? a question. If you look at the front of the 9 9 e-mail on the first page, it has attachments A. It's not, no. 10 0 with titles, look likes there's titles of Q. How about the first title, "Friday Transfers. BONY records agreed," do you have .1 attachments. You see that? .1 2 A. It says -- are you referring to Friday 12 any recollection being familiar with that title? 13 .3 transfers, BONY records agreed? A. No. 14 Q. Okay. If you look at Exhibit 140B, 4 O. Yes. . 5 same question: If you look in the attachments .5 A. Okay. it has some titles to various attachments, and Q. Are those titles, do those look like . 6 . 6 .7 titles that would be prepared by Lehman? 17 my question is are you familiar with any of 18 those attachments or the titles to those . 8 A. They weren't titles that would have 19 attachments? 9 been prepared by me. I don't know if they were 20 20 A. I recognize terms in the title, but I prepared by anybody else at Lehman. 21 don't recall if those were particular titles Q. Well, do you know if Mr. Tonucci's 21 22 specifically that I was familiar with. 22 crew or anyone else at Lehman was preparing 23 O. Did you prepare any other schedules 23 schedules in this reconciliation effort that we other than the one that we first looked at? 24 24 discussed earlier? 25 MR. SHAW: Objection to form. 25 MR. SPENCER: 139B. Page 153 Page 152 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA 1 1 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA 2 someone from Lehman had prepared them. 2 Q. Other than the schedules that's in 3 3 139B, did you prepare any other schedules with O. Okav. A. But I don't know who. 4 respect to this reconciliation effort that we 4 5 Q. Okay. Not you, I take it? 5 talked about? A. Schedules, no. I mean, we worked on 6 A. It was not me. 6 7 the differences, but there were no other like O. Do you think that people in Mr. 7 8 schedules. This is what we knew to have taken 8 Tonucci's shop would have been preparing some 9 kind of schedules in connection with this 9 place or transferred on the night of the 18th. 10 Q. Did you prepare any schedules relating 10 reconciliation effort? 11 to what we've been calling the Schedule B 11 MR. SHAW: Objection. Calls for 12 12 speculation. assets? 13 MR. SHAW: Objection. Asked and 13 A. It would seem reasonable, but I don't 14 14 know -answered. 15 A. Yeah, I -- I provided information to 15 Q. Okay. 16 A. -- specifically. 16 Schedule B. I didn't prepare Schedule B. 17 Q. Okay. So, referring back to the cover 17 Q. Back to the schedule that you did in page of 140B, Exhibit 140B, do you know one way 18 fact produce. 18 A. 139, something? 19 19 or the other whether the schedules that are

20

21

22

23

24

25

GFS.

20

21 22

23

24

referenced by title on that page were prepared

A. Generally, these participant IDs are

Lehman participant IDs. So it would make sense

by Lehman or Barclays?

A. Definitively, no.

Q. Generally?

O. 139B. The values that are contained

in that schedule, can you describe for me where

you got them from within the Lehman system?

And how do you find them within the

A. They were taken from a system called

Page 154 Page 155 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA 1 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA 2 2 GFS system? A. How they would determine the marks I 3 3 A. They were extracted out of GFS. They don't know, unfortunately. were existing prices that were -- that were I 4 4 Q. Okay. Any other sources of data that 5 5 guess downloaded into a spreadsheet. would go into that pricing? 6 Q. And where were they downloaded from? 6 A. From my prospective, no. 7 7 Q. When you actually prepared that A. From GFS. 8 8 spreadsheet, how did you instruct the GFS system Q. Okay. But where does GFS get them, do you know? I mean, I'm trying to find out what's 9 to give you those prices? 10 . 0 the origin of those prices. I understand you A. Well, I -- actually, the spreadsheet downloaded them from the GFS system. 11 itself was created by somebody who works for me, 11 12 12 which is Nancy Denig. A. Right. 13 13 Q. Where does the GFS system get those Q. Okay. 4 14 A. And I know the methodology in how she prices? . 5 15 got the prices, but if you're asking me A. I can tell you generically it gets pricing -- it gets its pricing from various 16 specifically how did I mechanically pull the 6 17 vendor sources and there's a hierarchy of vendor 17 prices, I don't know, because unfortunately --18 18 Q. She would know? selection. 19 19 Q. Uh-huh. A. Yeah. 20 Q. I guess I'm trying to understand, if I 20 A. And to the extent there's no price, 21 typically the Product Control organization would 21 wanted to recreate those prices, how would I go 22 talk to traders to get traders' marks. 22 about doing it if I had access to the GFS 23 Q. Okay. So where there's no market 23 system, do you know? 24 information, the traders themselves can do -- do 24 A. You would look to the data from that 25 specific date and you would want to download the 25 they use a model of some sort? Page 156 Page 157 1 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA 1 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - J. HRASKA 2 2 before you identified them? pricing from that date, if it was available. 3 3 Q. But Nancy Denig is the one who A. Could you be more specific? Q. Well, when did you identify the 800 4 actually did that downloading to prepare this 4 5 5 Cusips? spreadsheet? 6 6 A. She obtained the prices. I don't know MR. SHAW: Objection to form. 7 whether it was her that downloaded it or a 7 A. The 800 Cusips were not actually identified by me. They were identified by the 8 8 technologist that provided it or -- but she 9 obtained the pricing for it. 9 Finance organization as Cusips which were on 10 Q. Did any of those values come from any 10 Schedule B but were not on the list of 11 source other than the GFS system, do you know? securities that we had transferred over to 11 2 A. That I wouldn't know. I mean, what I 12 Barclays. 1.3 Q. So where are those Cusips now? 13 know is that we got it from GFS. Other than the 14 A. From a location perspective or a -methodology of how GFS got them other than what 14 Q. Well, where are those securities now? 15 .5 I have described, I mean, I don't really know. 16 A. The securities themselves? They would Q. Okay. Very good. 16 17 17 be still in Lehman clearance boxes. Mr. Hraska, you were talking about the 18 800 Cusips that you identified but never made it 18 O. Okay. Do you know which boxes or --19 19 A. Well, various boxes. to Barclays? 20 O. Okay. You don't know specific --20 A. Uh-huh.

21

22

23

24

25

O. Remember that testimony?

MR. SHAW: You need to say yes or no.

Where were those Cusips residing

A. Uh-huh.

A. I'm sorry. Yes.

21

22

23

24

25

well, let me ask you this way: Is there a list

Q. Is there a file in Barclays that has a

A. Well, the list of the 800 Cusips is

somewhere of these 800 Cusips?

the list. I'm sorry, I'm not --